

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REVEREND HESBURGH'S LETTERS
TO VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW AND
NOTRE DAME

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, has laid down a series of guidelines to be followed on his campus in the event of student disorders. He has also made an eloquent plea that we avoid overreacting to instances of violence; that we permit the university community to enforce its own rules and make its own adaptations to reasonable suggestions for change.

Few other academic leaders have so effectively articulated the need for a balanced approach. I include excerpts from his letters to Vice President Agnew and the students of Notre Dame University at this point as part of a continuing effort to bring to the attention of my colleagues materials relating to academic disturbances:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1969]
EXCERPTS FROM HESBURGH'S LETTERS TO VICE
PRESIDENT AGNEW AND TO NOTRE DAME

(NOTE: Following are excerpts from a letter from the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, to Vice President Agnew, made public in Washington yesterday, and from an earlier open letter from Father Hesburgh to the Notre Dame students and faculty:)

LETTER TO AGNEW

The best salvation for the university in the face of any crisis is for the university community to save itself, by declaring its own ground rules and basic values and then enforcing them with the widest and deepest form of moral persuasion for the good life of the university, and consequent moral condemnation with academic sanctions for any movement against university life and values—especially violence, vandalism and mob action which are the antitheses of reason, civility and the open society which respects the right of each and all.

When moral persuasion and academic sanctions fail to deter those who show open contempt for the life style and self-declared values of the university community, there should be no hesitation to invoke whatever outside assistance is necessary to preserve the university and its values. However, it is the university that best judges its need for outside assistance and invokes this assistance, much as it would call for help in a three-alarm campus fire. Here the concern is survival against forces bent on destruction.

It is important to see and judge universities today as they really are, not as they appear to be. The bizarre and widely publicized antics of relatively few students and relatively even fewer faculty are accepted as the stereotypes of all students and all faculty, much to the disgust of this widely maligned majority of faculty and students.

The vast majority of university and college students today are a very promising and highly attractive group of persons: They are more informed, more widely read, better educated, more idealistic and more deeply sensitive to crucial moral issues in our times, more likely to dedicate themselves to good

rather than selfish goals, than any past generation of students I have known.

GOOD REASON FOR CONCERN

Many of the them are bothered by some aspects of American and world society and current values or the lack of them—with good reason in most cases. They would work very hard. I believe, if given a real opportunity to participate in changing this world for the better. They would also find out how hard this is to do and would quickly discard some of their more naive present solutions to our problems.

Even the most far-out students are trying to tell society something that may also be worth searching for today if they would only lower the volume so we could hear the message.

Anyway, the great majority of our students need better leadership than we or the faculty have been giving them. In a fast changing society the real crisis is not one of authority but a crisis of vision that alone can inspire great leadership and create great morale in any society.

A rebirth of great academic, civic and political leadership, a sharing of some of these youthful ideals and dreams (impossible or not) would be good for our universities and good for America too. It might also help us all remove some of the key problems that underline most of the unrest. The campus is really reflecting America and the world today in hi-fi sound and living color.

Part of the vision I have been speaking of must certainly include law and order. But curiously enough, one cannot really have law and order without another part of the vision: Greater achievement of justice in our times, more compassion for all, real love between the generations. All elements of the vision are interdependent. Moreover, the vision must be whole and real for everyone. Lastly, a measure of humor would help from time to time to break up the deathly seriousness of the present scene.

As to present action, I would make the following two suggestions:

(1) Assume for a few months that the university community—faculty, students, administration and trustees—are capable, in most cases, of laying down their own guidelines and effectively maintaining them in their usual free and independent university style. Things will be messy from time to time but we will make it as universities if we determine strongly to maintain our freedoms and our values. That determination is growing on every campus, every day now. Give it elbow room in which to grow and operate in its own good way.

(2) Where special help is needed, let all assume it will be asked for and given quickly, effectively and as humanly as possible given the provocations that surround the need for such outside help, as a last alternative to internal self-correction. But let it be understood that the university, and only the university, public or private, makes this determination.

If my two assumptions are correct, the crisis will pass without the further requirement of actions other than those contained in my assumptions, especially not repressive legislation, or overreaction in its many forms.

May I conclude with a word of optimism. As Dickens wrote in the "Tale of Two Cities," "It was the best of times and the worst of times." The worst, because many of our best traditions, as universities and as a nation, are under siege. The best of times, because we are going to win this battle, not by repressing the very values of rationality, civility and openness that we are trying to save, but by reinforcing them in our belief, in our lives, in our institutions and especially by

using them, and hopefully youth's great vigor and idealism as well, to attack the deeper problems yet ahead of us in our age-long walk out of the jungle into the light.

LETTER TO STUDENTS

This letter has been on my mind for weeks. It is both time and overtime that it be written.

My hope is that these ideas will have deep personal resonances in our own community, although the central problem they address exists everywhere in the university world today and, by instant communication, feeds upon itself. It is not enough to label it the alienation of youth from our society. God knows there is enough and more than enough in our often non-glorious civilization to be alienated from, be you young, middle-aged, or old.

The central problem to me is what we do about it and in what manner, if we are interested in healing rather than destroying our world. Youth especially has much to offer—idealism, generosity, dedication, and service. The last thing a shaken society needs is more shaking. The last thing a noisy, turbulent, and disintegrating community needs is more noise, turbulence, and disintegration. Understanding and analysis of social ills cannot be conducted in a boiler factory. Compassion has a quiet way of service. Complicated social mechanisms, out-of-joint, are not adjusted with sledge hammers.

Now to the heart of my message. You recall my letter of Nov. 25, 1968. It was written after an incident, or happening if you will. It seemed best to me at the time not to waste time in personal recriminations or heavy-handed discipline, but to profit from the occasion to invite this whole university community, especially its central councils of faculty, administration, and students, to declare themselves and to state their convictions regarding protests that were peaceful and those that threatened the life of the community by disrupting the normal operations of the university and infringing upon the right of others.

I now have a statement from the Academic Council, the Faculty Senate, the Student Life Council, some College Councils, the Alumni Board, and a whole spate of letters from individual faculty members and a few students. . . . In general, the reaction was practically unanimous that this community recognizes the validity of protest in our day—sometimes even the necessity—regarding the current burning issues of our society: War and peace, especially Vietnam; civil rights; especially of minority groups; the stance of the university vis-a-vis moral issues of great public concern; the operation of the university as university. There was also practical unanimity that the university could not continue to exist as an open society, dedicated to the discussion of all issues of importance, if protests were of such a nature that the normal operations of the university were in any way impeded, or if the rights of any members of this community were abrogated, peacefully or nonpeacefully.

I believe that I now have a clear mandate from this university community to see that: 1) our lines of communication between all segments of the community are kept as open as possible, with all legitimate means of communicating dissent assured, expanded, and protected; 2) civility and rationality are maintained as the most reasonable means of dissent within the academic community; and 3) violation of others' rights or obstruction of the life of the university are outlawed as illegitimate means of dissent in this kind of open society. Violence was especially deplored as a violation of everything that the university community stands for.

WHAT HAPPENS IF

Now comes my duty of stating, clearly and unequivocally, what happens if. I'll try to make it as simple as possible to avoid misunderstanding by anyone. May I begin by saying that all of this is hypothetical and I personally hope it never happens here at Notre Dame.

But, if it does, anyone or any group that substitutes force for rational persuasion, be it violent or non-violent, will be given 15 minutes of meditation to cease and desist. They will be told that they are, by their actions, going counter to the overwhelming conviction of this community as to what is proper here. If they do not within that time period cease and desist, they will be asked for their identity cards. Those who produce these will be suspended from this community as not understanding what this community is. Those who do not have or will not produce identity cards will be assumed not to be members of the community and will be charged with trespassing and disturbing the peace on private property and treated accordingly by law.

The judgment regarding the impeding of normal university operations or the violation of the rights of other members of the community will be made by the dean of students. Recourse for certification of this fact for students so accused is to the tri-partite Disciplinary Board established by the Student Life Council. Faculty members have recourse to the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual. Judgement of the matter will be delivered within five days following the fact, for justice deferred is justice denied to all concerned.

After notification of suspension, or trespass in the case of non-community members, if there is not then within five minutes a movement to cease and desist, students will be notified of expulsion from this community and the law will deal with them as non-students.

Let there be any possible misunderstanding, it should be noted that law enforcement in this procedure is not directed at students. They receive academic sanctions in the second instance of recalcitrance and, only after three clear opportunities to remain in student status, if they still insist on resisting the will of the community, are they then expelled and become non-students to be treated as other non-students, or outsiders.

A RESPONSIBILITY OUTLINED

There seems to be a current myth that university members are not responsible to the law, and that somehow the law is the enemy, particularly those who society has constituted to uphold and enforce the law. I would like to insist here that all of us are responsible to the duly constituted laws of this university community and to all of the laws of the land. There is no other guarantee of civilization versus the jungle or mob rule, here or elsewhere.

I have studied at some length the new politics of confrontation. The rhythm is simple: 1) find a cause, any cause, silly or not; 2) in the name of the cause, get a few determined people to abuse the rights and privileges of the community so as to force a confrontation at any cost of boorishness or incivility; 3) once this has occurred, justified or not, orderly or not, yell police brutality—if it does not happen, provide it by foul language; physical abuse, whatever, and then count on a larger measure of sympathy from the up-to-now apathetic or passive members of the community. Then call for amnesty, the head of the president on a platter, the complete submission to any and all demands.

So it has gone, and it is generally well orchestrated. Again, my only question: Must it be so? Must universities be subjected, willy-nilly, to such intimidation and victimization whatever their good will in the matter? Somewhere a stand must be made.

I only ask that when the stand is made necessary by those who would destroy the community and all its basic yearning for great and calm educational opportunity, let them carry the blame and the penalty. No one wants the forces of law on this or any other campus, but if some necessitate it, as a last and dismal alternative to anarchy and to mob tyranny, let them shoulder the blame instead of receiving the sympathy of a community they would hold at bay. The only alternative I can imagine is turning the majority of the community loose on them, and then you have two mobs. I know of no one who would opt for this alternative—always lurking in the wings.

BOMBARDED BY BOTH SIDES

We can have a thousand resolutions as to what kind of a society we want, but when lawlessness is afoot, and all authority is flouted, faculty, administration, and student, then we invoke the normal societal forces of law beneath our hapless and hopeless gaze. I have no intention of presiding over such a spectacle: Too many people have given too much of themselves and their lives to this university to let this happen here. Without being melodramatic, if this conviction makes this my last will and testament to Notre Dame, so be it. . . .

May I now confess that since last November I have been bombarded mightily by the hawks and the doves—almost equally. I have resisted both and continued to recognize the right to protest—through every legitimate channel—and to resist as well those who would unthinkingly trifle with the survival of the university as one of the few open societies left to mankind today. . . .

I truly believe that we are about to witness a revulsion on the part of legislatures, state and national, benefactors, parents, alumni, and the general public for much that is happening in higher education today. If I read the signs of the times correctly, this may well lead to a suppression of the liberty and autonomy that are the lifeblood of a university community. It may well lead to a rebirth of fascism, unless we ourselves are ready to take a stand for what is right for us. History is not consoling in this regard. We rule ourselves or others rule us, in a way that destroys the university as we have known and loved it.

POSTAL PATRONAGE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Keokuk Daily Gate City recently carried an editorial on the subject of postal patronage. This editorial supports the reform advanced by President Nixon and Postmaster General Blount. I, too, support the proposed reforms which they have been advanced, particularly as amplified by Postmaster General Blount in a recent news conference. Having received permission I insert in the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred.

POSTAL PATRONAGE SYSTEM

Some 3,400 new postmasters and rural mail carriers are appointed each year, usually as a result of political patronage. It is the one real area of patronage for members of Congress. For that reason, the announcement that President Nixon and his Postmaster General intend to end the patronage system for selecting postmasters has aroused instant opposition.

The President's statement said that ap-

pointments now will be made under open competitive examination, with top qualifiers being appointed. That is the way appointments are supposed to be made now. However, to make sure that political appointees get the jobs, posts are held open until the preferred person is qualified.

Sometimes, that takes so long, the particular post office suffers. Major post offices with receipts in the tens of millions often go without a postmaster for years. It is to fill these posts that Postmaster General Winton M. Blount wants to do away with political patronage. As he says, "There is no valid connection between a man's political beliefs and his ability to deliver the mail."

Agreed. But when he tried to tell it to Congress, he learned that the members had other ideas. If Blount can put his plan across, it should mean greater efficiency and better morale—and perhaps faster mail.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some people have hailed as a strictly harsh and simplistic statement of the obvious by the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, the following communication from Father Hesburgh to the Vice President of the United States is a calm, balanced, and sensible treatment of the conflicts college campuses are experiencing all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, a partial text of the letter follows:

LETTER FROM REVEREND HESBURGH

President Nixon has asked me to give you my views regarding campus unrest and possible action on the occasion of your meeting this week with the governors of the fifty states. The President most wisely states that any action must be consistent with the vital importance of maintaining the traditional independence of American universities.

In the concluding sentence of my recent letter to Notre Dame faculty and students, I voiced my own central concern in the face of our current crisis: "We rule ourselves, or others rule us, in a way that destroys the university as we have known and loved it." Universities, like countries, can be equally destroyed from inside or from outside. The motivation may be different, to hurt or to help, but the result is the same—on our university: mob rule instead of civility, force substituting for reason, tyranny for persuasion, police state instead of the house of the intellect with all its glorious virtues exercised in freedom.

I shall make any comments as brief as possible.

1. The best salvation for the university in the face of any crisis is for the university community to save itself, by declaring its own ground rules and basic values and then enforcing them with the widest and deepest form of moral persuasion for the good life of the university, and consequent moral condemnation with academic sanctions for any movement against university life and values—especially violence, vandalism and mob action. . . .

2. When moral persuasion and academic sanctions fail . . . there should be no hesitation to invoke whatever outside assistance is necessary to preserve the university and its values. However, it is the university that best judges its need for outside assistance and invokes this assistance. . . .

3. It is important to see and judge universities today as they really are, not as they appear to be. . . . The vast majority of university and college students today are a very promising and highly attractive group of persons: They are more informed, more widely read, better educated, more idealistic and more deeply sensitive to crucial moral issues in our times, more likely to dedicate themselves to good rather than selfish goals than any past generation of students I have known. Many of them are bothered by some aspects of American and world society and current values or the lack of them—with good reason in most cases. . . . Even the most far-out students are trying to tell society something that may also be worth hearing today if they would only lower the volume so we could hear the message.

Anyway, the great majority of our students need better leadership than we or the faculty have been giving them. . . . A rebirth of great academic, civic and political leadership, a sharing of some of these youthful ideals and dreams (impossible or not) would be good for our universities and good for America too. . . .

4. Part of the vision I have been speaking of must certainly include law and order. But curiously enough, one cannot really have law and order without another part of the vision: Greater achievement of justice in our times, more compassion for all, and real love between the generations. . . . Lastly, a measure of humor would help from time to time to break up the deadly seriousness of the present scene.

5. As to present action, I would make the following two suggestions:

A. Assume for a few months that the university community—faculty, students, administration and trustees—are capable, in most cases, of laying down their own guidelines and effectively maintaining them in their usual free and independent university style. Things will be messy from time to time but we will make it as universities if we determine strongly to maintain our freedoms and our values. That determination is growing on every campus, every day now. Give it elbow room in which to grow and operate in its own good way.

B. Where special help is needed, let all assume it will be asked for and given quickly, effectively and as humanely as possible given the provocations that surround the need for such outside help, as a last alternative to internal self correction. But let it be understood that the university, and only the university, public or private, makes this determination.

If my two assumptions are correct, the crisis will pass without the further requirements of actions other than those contained in my assumptions, especially not repressive legislation, or over-reaction in its many forms.

FOR CLEAN WATER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive and important appointments made recently in the executive branch was that of former Illinois State Representative Carl L. Klein as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Conservation.

The Chicago Tribune in a very appropriate editorial Friday, February 28, comments on the soundness of this appointment.

May I add that Assistant Secretary Klein is greatly respected by all of us who have had the occasion to work with him. I believe he will very effectively serve the public interest in the vital area of water pollution.

The editorial follows:

FOR CLEAN WATER

In announcing the appointment of Carl L. Klein as assistant secretary of the interior, Secretary Hickel introduced him as "Mr. Clean Waters of Illinois." Klein, a Chicago Republican, earned the title as the foremost advocate in the state legislature of action to control pollution in Lake Michigan and other waters in this state. Among other things, he was chairman of both the Illinois Water Pollution and Water Resources commission and the Illinois House committee on water resources.

As assistant secretary for water quality and research, Klein will have jurisdiction over the entire federal program of water pollution control and will direct the interior department's water resources research programs. This is obviously an area of vital public concern.

Critics have been quite vocal in charging Secretary Hickel with being something less than enthusiastic toward the cause of conservation. If the secretary's selection of Klein reflects his determination to prove his critics wrong, he has made a worthy appointment. We expect the new assistant secretary to be every bit as energetic and forceful in pursuing the objective of clean water from his vantage point in Washington as he was here in Illinois.

BUSINESS RESPONSE—THROUGH ADVERTISING—TO THE ISSUES OF THE DAY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending the American Advertising Federation's Eleventh Annual Government Affairs Conference in Washington, D.C. With the recent attention focused on some segments of the advertising industry, I was pleased that this conference was an important step in promoting a meaningful dialog between industry and Government. I would like to take this opportunity to share the excellent speech of two participants, Norman E. Cash, president of the Television Bureau of Advertising, and Walter E. Terry, chairman of the board of the American Advertising Federation:

BUSINESS RESPONSE—THROUGH ADVERTISING—TO THE ISSUES OF THE DAY

(Presentation prepared by Television Bureau of Advertising to be presented by Norman E. Cash, president)

Thank you for letting us be here on your agenda this morning.

Our time in history somehow associates size with importance. As this cartoon illustrates, we like to make even ourselves larger and, therefore, more important.

We do it in our advertising.

And today we find the same concern over size among some of our most serious businessmen.

So I think it speaks well for us in the advertising business that our largest advertiser is also our most important one and in

so many ways illustrates the best that advertising can be. I do not refer to General Motors. Nor do I mean Procter & Gamble, proud as we are of them both.

I refer to the Advertising Council whose advertising campaigns last year received some \$352 million worth of media time and space, a figure that's some 90% of the combined expenditures of both GM and P & G.

I feel it is significant that our country's largest advertiser is the one most conspicuously dedicated to the public good.

I say "conspicuously" because I believe almost all advertising is for the public good. An ad that presents news of a faster way to communicate is a public service. An advertisement for a new car or a message for an established product . . . all these help meet a need and are public service.

And news of a public need . . . this too is public service. And this type of advertising . . . that also meets corporate business objectives . . . is what I'd like to talk with you about this morning. I speak not of charity but of business.

Two years ago, Bruce Palmer of NICB told our Board that "The first business of business is profits . . . but that profits deteriorate in a suspicious, resentful, hostile atmosphere."

The atmosphere in which we do business . . . how much it's changed since this businessman kept his rifle handy by the rear wheel of his wagon. That gun may be a symbol of business responsibility in those days.

Calvin Coolidge (in a talkative mood) said "The Business of America is Business". Coolidge was updated when Henry Luce said "The Business of Business is America".

A blue-sky slogan? I don't think so.

Take, for example, the problem of unemployment and its related problem of help-wanted. Unemployment may sound like a public problem, but help wanted is a business problem and the two are being brought together . . . for the good of both. Watch how one manufacturer uses his advertising skill to combine a social and corporate message into one commercial.

(Roll, General Electric Commercial.)

The need for better lighting to help reduce crime becomes a job with a social challenge . . . and illustrates a concern for people . . . and advertising made it happen.

At the other end of the unemployment scale . . . the hardcore unemployed. Here again business is using advertising to tell many messages in one message.

(Roll, Gulf Watts Service Station Commercial.)

A Gulf message for the ghetto . . . for its stockholders and for its customers.

Both these messages illustrated the growing involvements of business in the environmental problems of urban decay and rural blight, poverty and pollution, schools . . . crime . . . delinquency. This concentrated list is really a cover . . . of a booklet some half million copies of which were distributed after three hours of network TV sponsored by the Institute of Life Insurance.

Here is how their program was introduced.

(Roll, Institute of Life Insurance Commercial.)

The president of Xerox attacked a related problem in their six and a half hours of programming called "Of Black America" when he said, "We believe that understanding the world we live in is as much our business as the world we work in."

The growing interest in business involvement with our social problems is illustrated by TvB's invitation to address a joint meeting of two important NICB groups: Those involved with public affairs, and those responsible for company contributions. These people are close to senior management too but usually do not share your skills in the use of mass media advertising . . . advertising that we believe can help top manage-

ment meet these new and broader corporate goals.

Often you have assigned your advertising agency responsibility only for marketing your product. Their skills, like yours, can be put to work changing the environment within which your product is marketed . . . but only if you will show them the difference between a cost-per-thousand method of evaluating advertising and advertising media . . . and contributions-per-thousand . . . which is often more important.

How do these two measures differ? Who, for example, would sponsor a program reaching mainly the unemployed? But there is such a program . . . and public utilities and phone companies sponsor it . . . and it's called "Opportunity Line." Now covering half of America, it is a want-ad of the air . . . aimed at those who can't or don't read the help-wanted ads of their daily newspaper.

When half of such locally produced public service programming is not offered for sale, we believe it is a lost opportunity for the advertiser and the viewer.

Perhaps you saw last month's "Grocery Manufacturer" magazine's article about a local program the Heinz Company sponsors . . . called "Job Call". Here's a kinescope segment.

(Roll Heinz KDKA-TV Kinescope.)

The budget for that program is from the public relations budget of Heinz, not the regular advertising budget.

Perhaps you saw in the October 6th New York Time Magazine the story of kids and cars . . . an article that showed this poster and containing this Advertising Council ad. The same message has become a television message.

(Roll Advertising Council Take-Your-Keys Commercial.)

The ideas of the Advertising Council can become your ideas just as Royal Globe Insurance takes this idea to be their own.

(Roll Royal Globe Insurance Take-Your-Keys Commercial.)

Crime is an obvious expense to insurance companies . . . but we pay the premiums. Speaking of crime, this little fellow cost us billions last year . . . because we paid this man to catch him. And even this private policeman is cheap when you look at the electronic equipment he used . . . equipment we paid for not to stop an enemy invasion, but as part of our private police force of 170,000 . . . which we maintain to keep employee dishonesty at the two-billion dollar level . . . because "More thieves break out than break in" . . . our own employees cost us two billion business dollars a year . . . in what they take from our business.

Crime is a business expense when pilferage equals profits . . . as it does for the A & P. It seems the only ones to have benefited from all this are the criminals . . . and the Pinkerton and Burns stockholders.

Let me bring up one more business and social problem . . . and invite any of you to find a way to communicate it to the American people. This happy man . . . our friendly bookie . . . is our closest link to drugs in our high schools. The two dollar bet with him is his payoff to the police . . . which is his license to underwrite the whole of syndicated crime. How big is his take? Listen to an expert?

(Roll Salerno Kinescope.)

Crime is a concern of business for business reasons. It may become part of our advertising . . . like this message from the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association telling about the policeman who may never walk again thanks to his injury sustained while putting down riots on the Columbia University Campus. Or this ad from the Uniformed Firemen's Association . . . telling how hard it is to put out fires and dodge bricks and bottles at the same time.

This man is a crime fighter . . . by putting up lights on his home. A message sponsored by the Realtors' National Foundation, Inc.

An ad like this . . . with increases like these, can lead to an R. H. Macy Department store ad with this gun control message . . . or a similar one from Abraham & Straus . . . and both for business reasons: If people are afraid to go out on the streets at night, why have branch stores open?

Did you see the cover story in last month's "Nation's Business"? It talked about Operation Shakedown . . . as the underworld comes into the business world . . . and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in its booklet asks . . . will your business be next?

NCCD, incidentally, offers a series of folders that we as advertisers could offer . . . as a public service to our viewers and readers, as a business service to our customers . . . as a profit move for ourselves.

Shoplifting is a crime but even good booklets like these won't impress teenagers until we find a way to let them know the booklets exist . . . perhaps through paid advertisements like this ad in a recent paper.

Your name . . . your corporate name . . . adds importance, adds belief . . . and sponsorship makes it better.

Much of the concern over crime starts with the need for more police, for better police . . . for more understanding of current police. Here are two different messages . . . that could have been your contribution.

(Roll Los Angeles Police Force Message.)

(Roll Detroit Police Force Message.)

Poverty is another business concern . . . for both social and business reasons.

(Roll Urban America "Kitty" Commercial.)

If poverty could be reduced by one-third, the increase in consumer spending would be 21%.

Education is a business concern . . . at all levels of education. Here is an ad for the United Negro College Fund . . . a fund to which almost every major corporation donates dollars. We would like to show you a contribution made by the Polaroid Corporation . . . a three-minute commercial run twice on network television . . . and then offered in one minute version for other advertisers. This, to us, is modern corporate advertising proving corporate concern.

(Roll Polaroid Commercial for UNCF.)

Where can you go to help? Everywhere are messages that need telling, and experts to help. The Urban Coalition knows the cities and their problems, the National Alliance of Businessmen knows unemployment, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency knows crime's costs; but they all need your advertising skills and your advertising budget.

Why should you help? Senator Dirksen gave one reason: "Government can't do it alone." I believe your own business records will give you another reason. And so will your citizenship.

I would like to close this morning by thanking you all for one example of what we can together accomplish . . . you with your advertising skills, and we, the mass media with our audiences.

Hunger in our land of plenty is a business concern . . . a social concern. It also became a personal concern when CBS telecast its report to America.

I call your attention to the folder describing the results. At the top, it says the program "moved the nation to tears". This was the first step.

But at the bottom of the folder is the real result: it moved people to action.

As people deeply concerned with the business of advertising, as manufacturers and media, how well we use our skills may well determine our right to advertise . . . and test our belief that the "Business of Business is America".

As individuals, as companies, you have done much to help and we in media have done much too. Together, we believe we can both do more.

Thank you.

WHEN THEY DON'T COUNT ON YOU, THEY MAY BE COUNTING YOU OUT

If you want to know what you can expect from your public, perhaps you should first know more about what your public expects from you.

Reported here is the percent and the type of people who expect and wish business, government, education, religion, unions to do more in helping solve these social problems:

(In percent)

	Government	Business	Schools	Religious	Unions
Pollution.....	89	30	3	5	5
Violence.....	85	11	20	30	10
Crime.....	90	12	7	10	7
Education.....	35	12	84	15	5
Delinquency.....	50	12	47	45	6
Poverty.....	82	30	11	25	15

Information comes from the TvB-commissioned R. H. Bruskin and Associates nationwide survey of 2,664 adults between September 2 and October 3, 1968.

TvB's Question: "In your personal opinion, which of these groups should be more involved in helping solve these social problems?"

REMARKS BY WALTER E. TERRY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, AMERICAN ADVERTISING FEDERATION, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT D'ARCY ADVERTISING CO., AT THE 11TH ANNUAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 17 TO 19, 1969, WASHINGTON, D.C.

First, let me extend a warm welcome to you all on behalf of the AAF staff, its elected officials, and particularly those who have labored so hard and effectively to bring this conference about.

We hope you will find it informative and productive. The purpose of the conference is to explore advertising issues and projects pertinent to government and to the public we serve. These issues will be discussed from our industry point of view as well as that of government. It is hoped that this coming together of the government and private sectors will result in a better understanding of each other and hopefully point the way to further government-industry cooperation on matters affecting the public interest.

The effort to develop understanding and cooperation between industry and government is, of course, one of the major objectives of the AAF. And during the past 12 months your Federation has made considerable headway in strengthening its capacity to serve advertising and the public.

For the first time we are meeting in the Nation's Capital with our national headquarters located here. The purpose of the move was to better represent and articulate the views of advertising in the place where decisions affecting the future of our business are made. And we are being listened to. Our views do carry increased weight and—most important of all—increased respect. And we now are in a better position to provide information and service to government than at any time in our history.

Since our last conference, Federation activity on the governmental front has intensified. AAF spoke out strongly against the FTC's recommendations to Congress on cigarette advertising, testified in the Congress against the application of the Fairness Doctrine to advertising, filed comments in the FTC proceeding on co-op advertising, testified in the FTC consumer hearings, and authorizing a filing in the Iowa ad tax appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The AAF Model Law on deceptive practices at the state level has been approved and distributed for introduction within those states where the public is not now adequately protected from such practices.

But, as in the past, AAF is not solely concerned with government relations. Your Federation—through our grass roots strength

in the 178 advertising clubs throughout the nation where our over 40,000 members live and work and vote—has active programs and will continue to work in the fields of Education, Public Service and Ethics. A good example of this activity is the Advertising Code of American Business which was developed by AAF and now has been adopted by all of the clubs and over 50 other organizations throughout the land.

But in spite of the many positive steps we and other advertising associations have taken, some of the results of which you will be seeing during the Conference, our critics seem to multiply and become more vocal. You remember the same old list of charges: Advertising stimulates our appetite for things we don't need. Advertising corrupts the English language. Advertising is materialistic. Advertising turns television into a vast wasteland. Advertising is fraudulent. Advertising helps sell products that are shoddy and harmful.

And during the year just past, when the acceptance of and interest in advertisements reached what must be considered a recent high, advertising itself stood accused, among other things, of escalating the incidence of violence in the United States, of encouraging industrial monopoly, of promoting racism, of encouraging the use of lethal weapons among children, and finally, of controlling the outcome of a national presidential election.

Accusations of this sort remind me of the lady in California, who, after nearly three recent weeks of statewide stormy weather, rain, hail, snow, floods and mudslides, was reported to have complained: "We never had weather like this under the Johnson Administration!"

More seriously, over a longer period of time, we have seen an increasing willingness on the part of government to investigate, regulate and control what is loosely identified as "the advertising business." For people like us who work in this field, government intervention—actual or threatened—has become a day-to-day fact of life. And living with threats of this sort, in a business whose political power is, at best, limited, has produced a climate which can hardly be described as "healthy."

During this past year, as you know, Iowa imposed a tax on advertising—as though an advertisement were, in fact, a sale—a claim, incidentally, that even the strongest advocates of advertising have shrunk from making. To tether this beast, advertising, the Iowa legislature has succeeded in imposing what is, in effect, a tax on the expression of free speech. And advocates of the advertising tax are now extending their efforts to other states. This is a most unwholesome prospect for all of us. For when some people must pay to exercise a right, that right has been compromised for everyone.

The Iowa tax, threats of government intervention (such as the FCC ruling on cigarette advertising), and the continuing social criticism of advertising, spring from the same source: a gross misunderstanding of the role advertising plays in our society.

Advertising cannot and does not fundamentally change the way that masses of people think and feel about themselves. It might change what they think about a product. Provided the product lives up to the message. But advertising does not create either our social values or our institutions. It only reflects them. That is why so much of the criticism of what is collectively called on "Madison Avenue" is actually an attack on society itself.

Does advertising really stimulate our appetite for things we don't need? Or is the right to advertise such products merely part of the right to manufacture and sell them? And further, who should define what we need or don't need—the government—or the people?

Does advertising really corrupt the English language? Or merely use it in many different ways, the way the people who speak it do?

Is advertising materialistic? The man who believes, really believes, that material possessions will make him truly happy deserves our pity more than our legislative help.

Is advertising ruining television at a time when commercials are being included in the film collection of the Museum of Modern Art?

Read what people say about the advertising of their time, and it will tell you how they regard themselves and their society:

"Advertisements contain the only truths to be relied upon in a newspaper," wrote Thomas Jefferson.

"Advertising stimulates such an insatiable hunger for individual acquisition that our society has become unbalanced," said John Galbraith.

Can there be any doubt what John Galbraith would say about a tax on advertising? Or, more importantly, what Thomas Jefferson would say?

As an advertising man who finds himself presented with the unusual opportunity of addressing this Eleventh Annual Government Conference, I wish to make what may seem to be a simple request to government representatives who interest themselves in our affairs and who are attempting to establish values regarding advertising other than those of law and order:

"Treat us as we are, not as you would have us be. Resist the shifting pressures of changing public opinion and treat us with consistency. Give us a fair shake, grant us the respect we have earned, and you will have our support and assistance."

"In short, we ask only for a permanent and earned respect. We recognize that every business has responsibilities to the society in which it operates, and that there is a great need for developing social consciousness on the part of business. We say to you we have assumed our responsibilities more so than any other major industry, and if you will allow us to do so we will continue to be dedicated to our responsibilities and the economic development of our great country."

The French writer, Antoine de St. Exupery once wrote that "To be a man, is, precisely, to be responsible."

That, and no more, is what advertising seeks from government. The freedom to be responsible.

This should be a profitable two and a half days for us all, but I would hope that the end of the conference will just mark the beginning of a renewed effort to utilize the vast grass roots strength of AAF to advance the advertising profession. We can do this in many ways, including:

1. Developing a strong legislative alertment system in each club to guard against unfair or unwarranted restrictions on the freedom of advertising.

2. Establishing an effective ethics program in each club to promote the highest standards of the advertising profession as epitomized in the Advertising Code of American Business, to implement the new Model Deceptive Practices Act in each state where there do not now exist adequate laws.

3. Maintaining a continuing effort to inform the public, educators and government officials about the positive values and contributions of advertising to society.

4. Developing constructive programs to aid in meeting the major public needs of our communities and Nation utilizing the tools of advertising and marketing.

5. Establishing and maintaining closer ties with the educational institutions of our communities, especially informing young people about the virtues of advertising as a career.

6. Seeking even better communication and idea exchange between our own members and other associations to encourage an all-indus-

try support for worthwhile efforts and to enlist active awareness and backing of AAF in its unique position of representing the interests of all advertising.

For my part, the opportunity to serve as your chairman is a most rewarding experience. The dedicated work of my predecessors and the highly skilled professional staff we now have have made my job a lot easier. The job of all of us is to build on the great strides which AAF has made since last year's conference. And we can begin by getting the most out of this year's fine program and putting it to work for AAF and the industry we serve.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme for this year was "Freedom's Challenge."

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the speech of the winner of the Massachusetts competition, Miss Lynn Holoway, who is a resident of my district. I think that both she and the Veterans of Foreign Wars should be congratulated for their efforts in this area.

The contest entry follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Lynn Holoway)

We are America's future. Today's young generation will soon be called to lead tomorrow's society. But are we sure that we can fulfill such a responsibility? The challenge is great. It is difficult to imagine a life without the many rights and privileges we enjoy. We think nothing of traveling outside of the United States, working in whatever profession we choose, or criticizing our government when we do not feel that her policies are the best, because few of us have known any other kind of existence. But freedom must not be taken for granted. We have to live for it, work for it, and when it is threatened, fight for it. Apathy will open America to the enemies of democracy, and we shall perish.

I have often felt guilty when I have heard of the hunger, the poverty, and the persecution existing in other countries, or reports of boys not much older than myself who have given their lives for us at home. It has made me wonder what I have done to help preserve freedom. But I think that I am beginning to realize that "freedom's challenge" means the little things, too—things every American is capable of. It is not just words, though, it is "doing." It seems very patriotic to boast of America's greatness, but it is more important to vote conscientiously. It is fine to wave a flag or march in a parade, but all too often patriotism ends there.

Being an American is more than living in this country and reaping the benefits. Each citizen is part of a great wheel that runs a little less steadily with every weak spoke. Our nation is not run by one man or by a hundred men. The President and our Congress are representatives of the thoughts and feelings of the small farmers, the truck drivers, the financial executives, you, and

me. They are the echoes of the millions of Americans in our cities and towns. Their power is based on our faith and our support.

America today sometimes rumbles with voices of doubt, of anger, and of fear. It is frightening to hear reports of riots, of racial and political unrest, or of the assassinations of some of America's greatest men; but I think of our fine Olympic athletes, the advances we have made in science and technology, our prosperity, all the aid we have given to foreign nations, the many men who have died at home and abroad for freedom's cause, I know that America, although she may stumble, with all men working together, and the help of God, will not fail.

RETIREMENT OF SAM H. FRANKS

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of this House the recent retirement of Samuel H. Franks from his position as director of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mr. Franks has truly served with distinction as a hospital director for the Veterans' Administration.

A native of Liverpool, England, he was first affiliated with the Veterans' Administration shortly after the conclusion of World War II, when he was employed in the then Veterans' Administration branch office at San Francisco, Calif. He was named assistant director of the old Oakland Hospital on April 2, 1952, and 2 years later was named director. He served in that capacity until that hospital was closed and a new facility opened in nearby Martinez.

Following the conclusion of his service in California, he was transferred to the Veterans' Administration hospital at West Haven, Conn., and on February 20, 1966, he assumed the position that he held until the time of his retirement.

Mr. Franks served in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army during World War II and brought to the Veterans' Administration a wealth of knowledge, a sparkling personality, a keen judgment of individuals, a know-how, and a dedication to the principle, which should motivate all our Veterans' Administration hospitals, that the veteran's care comes first; research, education, and affiliation with the medical school should be placed in a secondary role.

It is only fair to report that Mr. Franks was a troubleshooter for the Veterans' Administration during his period of service and frequently was called upon to correct an individual situation which had gotten beyond the ability of prior administrators to correct.

I first came to know of Mr. Franks' ability when he assumed the directorship of the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Salt Lake City. Older Members of this House will recall that I had to endure some criticism from the press and from the citizens of the State of Utah for bringing to the attention of the public the deplorable conditions which had been permitted to arise in the Veterans' Ad-

ministration Hospital at Salt Lake City in 1965 and 1966. It was truly a shocking condition and one which was in urgent need of correction. After considerable pressure and publicity on my part, the Veterans' Administration did reassign several employees, reprimand some physicians, and counsel others involved in unfortunate incidents in the hospital which compelled the retirement of the prior director. Mr. Franks moved quickly and firmly to rectify the then existing deplorable conditions and to assure the primacy of veteran's care. In so doing he had to take considerable abuse which would have been better directed at others. Officials in Washington did not always give him the support to which, in my judgment, he had a right to expect.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this opportunity to call the attention of this House to the yeoman service to Mr. Franks and the appreciation we who have had the opportunity to know of his work feel for his activities. I, along with all others who knew of his dedicated service, wish him the happiest sort of retirement. The public service will miss him.

MEMPHIS CIVIC LEADER GREAT HUMANITARIAN

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege last month to be one of the participants, along with Danny Thomas, in honoring one of Memphis' leading citizens for his outstanding contributions to humanitarian causes. Sam Cooper is president of the HumKo Products Division of the National Dairy Products Corp., a native Memphian, a respected and beloved member of the community.

Last month Mr. Cooper was honored as the eighth recipient of the Memphis Round Table's Brotherhood Award. No man has deserved the honor more. Sam Cooper has practiced the most precious precepts of brotherhood in his business life and in his community activity. Memphis is a much better community because of Mr. Cooper's untiring contributions to numerous civic projects and when an important city becomes a better place in which people may live, work, play and worship in freedom, our whole Nation is improved by that much.

I would like to note the presentation of the Brotherhood Award to Sam Cooper by including as a part of these remarks in the RECORD, an article from the Memphis Press-Scimitar of February 10, and another from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of February 11, 1969:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, Feb. 10, 1969]

DANNY THOMAS TO SPEAK AT NCCJ AWARD DINNER

(By Kay Pittman Black)

Television star Danny Thomas, who frequently makes trips to Memphis to promote the hospital he founded, St. Jude Children's Research Center, was in town today to help promote the humanitarian efforts of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Thomas will be guest speaker at 7 tonight at the annual Brotherhood Award Dinner of the Memphis Round Table of NCCJ. Allen Morgan, president of First National Bank, is dinner chairman. The event will be held at the Holiday Inn-Rivmont.

The Brotherhood Dinner pays special tribute to a Memphian who has greatly advanced the cause of brotherhood. Sam Cooper, civic leader and president of HumKo Products Division, will be honored tonight.

Morgan said 1,450 tickets to the \$35-a-plate dinner have been sold.

GREAT HONOR

Cooper said today, "This is one of the greatest honors to come to me."

Cooper, who lives at 50 Waring Road with his family, is 58 and a graduate of Humes High School.

Long active in civic affairs, he is on the board of St. Peter's Home and also serves on the board of Methodist Hospital. Until last year he was chairman of the Memphis Federal Reserve Board and this year was asked to serve on the St. Louis Board of Federal Reserve Banks.

CIVIC GROUPS

He is on the Business Committee for the Arts, a national organization, and has led fund drives for the Memphis Arts Council. He has served as president of Shelby United Neighbors, president of Ridgeway Country Club, a director of the Memphis Rotary Club and served on the board of directors of the American Red Cross.

Thomas spent a busy day in Memphis prior to the award dinner. He was to visit St. Jude's, attend a luncheon and visit with friends in Memphis.

Thomas founded the hospital in the late 1950s. Money was raised to build the hospital by various entertainers, including Thomas, who gave benefit shows. The hospital opened in 1962 as a research center for leukemia and other childhood diseases.

OTHER WINNERS

Previous Brotherhood Award winners are Edward F. Barry, 1962; the late Edward J. Meeman, 1963; Abe Plough, 1964; Everett R. Cook, 1965; J. R. Hyde, 1968; Norfleet Turner, 1967; and Frank R. Ahlgren, 1968.

Money raised at the annual dinner is used to promote community relations programs and interfaith workshops.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Feb. 11, 1969]

HIGH PRAISE ACCOMPANIES AWARD

"Brotherhood—what a precious commodity. No one has a monopoly on it and everyone can enjoy it."

Sam Cooper, eighth recipient of the Memphis Round Table's Brotherhood Award, thus expressed his feelings last night after more than 1,400 people gathered at the Holiday Inn-Rivmont to honor him.

Also speaking on the program was entertainer Danny Thomas, making his second National Conference of Christians and Jews recognition dinner address.

Allan B. Morgan, banquet chairman and president of the First National Bank of Memphis, presented Mr. Cooper with the citation.

Other Memphians who have won the award are Edward F. Barry, attorney; Edward J. Meeman, late editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar; Abe Plough, founder of Plough, Inc.; Everett R. Cook, founder of Cook & Co., cotton company; J. R. Hyde, honorary chairman of Malone & Hyde, Inc.; Norfleet Turner, chairman of the board of First National Bank of Memphis; and Frank R. Ahlgren, retired editor of The Commercial Appeal.

In his introduction of Mr. Cooper, Mr. Allen took the honoree's initials, "C" and "S," and used them to describe him.

"Shortening Champion (Mr. Cooper is president of HumKo Products Division of the

National Dairy Products Corp.), shrewd card player, short chipper, salesman of causes, self-contributor and superlative citizen.

"Sam Cooper is best known to Memphians as a man so dedicated to his beliefs and to the things that have to be done that he assumes a manner of responsibility in getting them done.

"Sam Cooper is a Memphian in the true sense of the word—born, reared and living and working in our city all of his life. "He started at the bottom and he has worked hard and long. He attended public schools here and at the age of 18 he got a job at the old Natural Cotton Seed Products Co., where he worked as office boy, stenographer and as a bookkeeper who had never kept a set of books."

In 1952 when HumKo and National Dairy Products merged he was made president.

"He started his brotherhood work by taking part in a SUN drive in 1960 and he responded with complete dedication.

"My participation in helping make our city a better place in which to live has been a labor of love. It has given me better understanding of brotherhood.

"What greater honor could a man receive? How blessed can a man be?"

Mr. Barry, the former honoree, then introduced Mr. Thomas, a man known to Memphians most importantly because of his connection with St. Jude Children's Research Hospital.

Mr. Thomas entertained the audience with his wit for half an hour, then closed on a more serious note.

"I am very happy today in the knowledge that the people of Memphis realize they are the owners and benefactors of St. Jude."

THE KINGDOM OF MOROCCO

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Kingdom of Morocco observes today its National Day, marking the eighth anniversary of King Hassan's accession to the throne and the 13th anniversary of the treaty under which Morocco regained her independence from the French in 1956.

It is appropriate that we mark this important date in the history of one of America's closest friends in the Arab world. While Morocco is a young country she was an ancient country when our Republic was in its youth. Morocco's Sultan Mohammed III in 1778 gave status to American merchant vessels and thereby became one of the first nations to recognize the United States. Our friendship over the years has been reconfirmed by the treaties of 1786 and 1836. The talks in 1943 between President Roosevelt and King Mohammed V, the late father of the present king, reconfirmed our longstanding friendship. Since Morocco regained her independence, our relations have been close.

Today Morocco is working for a better life for its people. King Hassan II gives priority to economic development, and particularly food production, in the allocation of his country's resources. The 5-year plan, 1968-72, calls for broad increases in productivity, which will be translated into higher standards of living for Morocco's 14 million people.

We are proud to be associated in this task with this young country, an old

friend. The cause of Moroccan-American friendship is further served by the presence in Washington of Ambassador Ahmed Osman and his charming wife, Princess Lalla Nezha, younger sister of the king.

JUST BIG-BRAINING?

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with all the charges and countercharges being made as a result of the Federal Communications Commission's proposed ruling to ban cigarette advertising on television and radio, I want to make available to the entire membership of the Congress an excellent editorial appearing in the February 8 edition of the Kentucky New Era of Hopkinsville, Ky.

The articulate thinking set out in this editorial clarifies the FCC's suggestion as a definite, two-sided action. I commend the Kentucky New Era's provocative editorial to all those interested in the cigarette-cancer issue, regardless of whether they consider themselves pro or con the FCC proposal:

JUST BIG BRAINING?

There has to be mixed feelings here on the proposal of the Federal Communications Commission to ban all cigarette advertising from television and radio.

This would be true if this community were not a tobacco-growing area with a sizable economic stake in the raising of the burley that goes into the cigarettes.

But, omitting the local slant and looking at the picture from only a nationwide angle, it's hard to escape a two-sided reaction to the FCC's suggestion. On the one hand the idea does make considerable sense. On the other, there is extreme danger in the precedent.

The FCC points out that it operates in the telecasting and broadcasting fields with the designated purpose of protecting the public's interest. What, it asks, could be more in the public's interest than a step it thinks will improve the public's health.

So, if the government and the people in Washington who speak for it are convinced, as the US surgeon general first charged in 1964, that cigarette smoking injures health and shortens the life of the smoker, it seems logical it should move to curb said smoking. It would seem foolish to do otherwise.

But the FCC would be moving into treacherous waters if it follows its proposal. The step would mark the first time the agency has ordered a ban on the advertising of any commodity the public can buy and consume legally. It is a move toward stifling of news media, a trend of which few Americans approve after seeing the effect of such gags in communist countries.

If the FCC can ban cigarette advertising, what is to prevent it from deciding next that since traffic accidents kill so many people, all ads involving automobiles should be banned from TV and radio? Or that in view of the 1968 assassinations, all news unfavorable to public officials should be kept off the air.

Not to be overlooked is the question of what effect the banning of cigarette commercials would really have on smoking. Obviously, the ban won't stop the puffing. People don't start smoking or smoke more because they see a man on TV wearing a hole in his shoe walking a mile for a certain type of cigarette.

National prohibition proved the fallacy of

thinking any government can legislate morals or personal habits. The only answer is improved thinking, and this doesn't come about by government decree.

Actually, we believe there is little likelihood the FCC will ever ban cigarette ads. This week's proposal seems more in the nature of some pressure on the Congress in regard to the health-and-tobacco campaign.

The present law, which requires a health warning to be put on all cigarette packages and equal even if free TV time to offset smoking ads, has definite restrictions against such steps as the ban on advertising. But the law is scheduled to expire next summer.

There is more than an outside chance the FCC's thinking is that it will just show Congress what can happen if the legislative branch of government doesn't extend the existing law or pass a stronger one.

In some circles that's what is known as big-braining.

THE DEMOLAY BOY

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, we all are aware of the fine work done by the Order of DeMolay in forming the characters of millions of American boys, so that over the years they have grown up to become among our finest citizens.

We hear much less of the background of DeMolay, of efforts put into this group by the members of the parent Masonic organizations. And we hear even less about why these dedicated men put forth that effort. And very rarely do we have an opportunity to hear that expressed with real eloquence and clarity.

It is my privilege to include in the RECORD, so that others may share it, the explanation of Masonry and DeMolay by Mr. Robert L. Gilmore, Most Worshipful Grand Master, of Puyallup, Wash.:

EXPLANATION OF MASONRY

Frank S. Land, DeMolay and Masonry, truly one for all and all for one.

Frank Sherman Land was born on June 21, 1890, initiated as an Entered Apprentice Mason in May of 1912 and completed the degrees in both York Rite and Scottish Rite Masonry in January 1913. Although he received many honors in the various appendant bodies of Masonry, including that of serving as Imperial Potentate of the Shrine of North America in 1954-1955, no other honor compares with the founding of the Order of DeMolay, for what he did for others has enshrined his name on the records of Freemasonry for all time.

From its founding in 1919 by "Dad" Land, with the original nine members, the Order of DeMolay has had over 3,000,000 young men kneel at its altars and be obligated to those things of reverence, filial love, patriotism, courtesy, cleanness, fidelity and comradeship.

I ask, do these virtues differ from our cardinal virtues and precious jewels?

In these days when our proud nation is faced with riots, premeditated arson, civil disobedience and wild rampages that border on insurrection and anarchy, with a yoke of infamy—of crime born of greed, hate, violence, lawlessness and worst of all by the apathy of otherwise good men, it is with a ray of hope for the future that we look to the young man of high virtue—the DeMolay boy.

He's the fellow between the ages of 14

and 21 who has dedicated himself to God, his country and his parents.

He's the fellow who is privileged to give expression to these virtues in DeMolay service.

He's the fellow who believes in spiritual values and has the courage to live them everyday.

He's the fellow we ask to fight for our country when it is in danger, and the measure of his service is the measure of our security (no draft card or flag burner is he).

He's the fellow who reverences mothers, and truly happy with Dad for his pal.

He's the fellow who seeks to serve others and aspires to leadership as prerequisite to good citizenship.

He's the fellow who likes to work and play knowing that work and play make a good DeMolay.

He's the fellow for whom you and I are working, and he will carry on what we have started.

He's the fellow into whose hands we will deliver the fate of our nation and the fate of all humanity.

That's the fellow who is the DeMolay boy, your son and my son.

Our youth groups issue invitation after invitation but enjoy only the visitation of those few dedicated Brothers who serve as Rainbow Dads, Associate Guardians of Job's Daughters and DeMolay Dads. Where are the remainder of our Brothers who profess that our youth is the hope of our future?

The height of human dignity is reached by free men choosing their destiny, humbly mindful of their obligations to their creator and their fellow man.

It is the duty of Masonry to assist in elevating the moral and intellectual level of society: In coining knowledge, bringing ideas into circulation and causing the mind of youth to grow: And in putting, gradually, by the teachings of axioms and the promulgation of positive laws, the human race in harmony with its destinies.

It is my contention that Freemasonry should compete for men's minds and souls by carrying to them a human relations program by which we would teach the duties which all men owe to God, to their fellow men and to their institutions—governmental, religious, educational and fraternal. We must not retreat from the problems of mankind behind the secure bulwark of our faith, but must be an articulate voice in the arts, religions, in politics, in economics and in education.

My brothers, I trust that those of you who attend DeMolay meetings and witness the school books on the altar and hear the charge, feel as I do, that here is a great bastion for the continued and complete separation of church and state. Must we leave this to our youth or shall we heed the words of Albert Pike:

"The citizen who cannot accomplish the smaller purposes of public life, cannot compass the larger. The vast power of endurance, forbearance, patience and performance of a free people, is required only by continual exercise of all the functions, like the healthful physical human vigor. If the individual citizens have it not, the state must be equally without it.

"It is of the essence of free government that the people should not only be concerned in the making of the laws, but also in their execution. No man ought to be more ready to obey and administer the law than he who has helped to make it. The business of government is carried on for the benefit of all and every co-partner should give counsel and co-operation."

Let us accept and fulfill our obligations to this and future generations by furnishing counsel for the youth groups, attendance at their meetings, transportation when required, and by contributing to their foundations. May each of us so live that he who governs all, looks with favor upon our efforts

to inculcate in our youth those principles set forth in the constitution of this Great Republic.

WAR IS ALL THE HORRIBLE THINGS A HUMAN CAN DO

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1969, Maj. Vincent Colasuonno, U.S. Air Force, was killed on a combat mission over Vietnam. Major Colasuonno and his family lived in Wichita, Kans., which is in my congressional district. He was a veteran of 17 years service in the Air Force.

Major Colasuonno left behind him a strong and meaningful message on the nature of war which was conveyed through a personal letter to the students of the Church of Magdalen School in Wichita where his children attend classes.

This poignant message about war was carried in newspapers throughout the Nation a few days following the death of this brave American. It was first reported and written by Jackie Helstrom, staff writer for the Wichita, Kans., Beacon.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the message left by Major Colasuonno as reported in the Beacon article. I have just returned from a brief inspection trip to Vietnam, and I have learned firsthand of the bravery and commitment of our American military men there. We owe a great debt to men such as Major Colasuonno. Perhaps we can meet a little of that debt by heeding the words of his message to the students at the Church of the Magdalen School.

The article follows:

WAR IS ALL THE HORRIBLE THINGS A HUMAN
CAN DO

(By Jackie Helstrom)

"War is all the horrible things a human being can do to another human being because he has not learned to love—rather to hate."

Those words of Air Force Maj. Victor Colasuonno, who fought in Vietnam, and died there last week, have remained behind him in a potent message on the nature of war.

When his letter on "what war is" was read last week to the students at Church of the Magdalen School, whose fourth grade class had received it, some of the students were in tears, others received the shock of reality with solemn silence.

"I'll tell you what war is not," Maj. Colasuonno wrote. "It is not a glamorous, daredevil existence where the 'good guys' always win."

"It is not a fearless fighter pilot jumping into his airplane to shoot down the enemy."

"It is not a game which you plan (and which I played as a child), where you go home to a good supper and a warm bed after it is over."

"War is fought by real human beings, not Hollywood stars—men like your daddy's and perhaps older brothers."

"We all face a moment of truth when we must overcome our fears and do what must be done, no matter how difficult."

"War is a time of tears when we must overcome our sorrow for our fellow comrades and

do what must be done, no matter how difficult."

"War is the curse of mankind because he will not listen to God's will. War is the agony of mankind because he will not love his neighbor, because he is greedy and selfish, because he is proud and arrogant, because he covets what his neighbor has and would rather try to take it from him than build it for himself."

With these words Maj. Victor Colasuonno tried to bring home to his young audience the answer to their question: "What is war like?"

Originally from New York, Maj. Colasuonno, 39, was stationed at McConnell Air Force Base before he was sent to Vietnam as an Air Force pilot last June.

While he was there, he had been corresponding regularly with the students at the church school, which his three sons, Kenneth, Bobby and Stephen, and daughter, Patty, attend.

At Christmas, the fourth grade class, of which his son Kenneth is a member, wrote Christmas cards and letters to him.

Some of the boys in the class asked him the question which brought his reply on the nature of war.

The letter was read to the class at the time it was received last month, but circumstances prevented it from being read to the entire school until last week when word of Maj. Colasuonno's death was received.

He was shot down over South Vietnam last Wednesday, and died en route to a hospital in Thailand.

"All of the children, even the little ones were greatly impressed with the letter," said Sister Jane Marie, principal of the school. "The older ones were deeply moved. Some were even in tears."

"Most of them didn't know him," she said. "He was a perfect stranger. But the letter was worded so they knew he was telling the truth."

"It was firsthand knowledge of what war is like."

Sister Jane Marie said she had been discussing with the seventh grade teacher only recently the fact that most of the students thought the war in Vietnam was "sort of a game."

"She was amazed that so few of them took it seriously," Sister Jane Marie said.

"This letter brought home to them something they had never given much thought to before," she said.

If man learns to love, Maj. Colasuonno concluded his letter, "there would be no wars, for man does not hurt what he loves."

"Perhaps your generation can accomplish this—it seems that mine has failed."

"Do not allow adults to teach you to hate—for no reason and against no man."

BALTIMORE SOLDIER DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4 James Berends, a fine young soldier from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

CITY SOLDIER, 21, DIES IN VIETNAM—JAMES BERENDS A CASUALTY OF MORTAL WOUNDS

A 21-year-old Southeast Baltimore man has been listed as a combat casualty in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday. He was the 13th Marylander to die in Vietnam this month and the 23d to die this year.

Spec. 4 James Berends died February 23 from wounds received during an enemy mortar attack. He had been in Vietnam since May 16, 1968.

He was drafted November 6, 1967, and underwent basic training at Fort Bragg.

In Vietnam he was assigned to a communications outfit attached to the 1st Air Cavalry Division.

His sister, Miss Judy Berends, said yesterday that in letters home, he indicated that "he felt he belonged there." She also said "he made the best of everything."

Before he was drafted, Specialist Berends worked on the assembly line of the Fisher Body Division of the General Motors Corporation. He lived at 719 South Decker street.

Besides his sister, he is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Milford L. Berends; a brother, Ronald Berends, who is a Baltimore city policeman, and another sister, Mrs. Gail Jacobs.

PUBLIC BRAINWASHING IN TV ENTERTAINMENT

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Crosby S. Noyes of the Washington Star is a brilliant logician who stays on solid ground.

In the issue of Saturday, March 1, he said exactly what millions of Americans have wished somebody would say about the entertainment world's propagandizing in race relations and the explosive potential it builds up.

Whoever "calls the shots" should consider carefully what Mr. Noyes says about this public brainwashing so obvious to all Americans.

I offer the column for the RECORD:

RACE RELATIONS TRANSFORMED TO TV ENTERTAINMENT

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

It comes in the middle of a fairly routine shoot-'em-up bit of TV boiler plate, in which most of the shooting happens to be done by a number of highly competent and strongly motivated Negro frontiersmen.

It's a sudden and somehow disturbing feeling that the television industry, like the movies before it, has gone out of the entertainment business and has been taken over, root and branch, by the propagandists.

Somebody out there is trying to tell us something. It almost makes you wonder, while we are all worked up about the "military-industrial complex," whether we might not also take a look at what the entertainment-propaganda complex is up to these days.

It is virtually impossible, of course, to overestimate the propaganda potential of the entertainment industry, once it really puts its mind to a given theme.

Within the lifetime of most of us, we have been successively entertained into hating Germans, Japanese and Russians, loving Russians and Chinese, liking Japanese and some Germans, hating Chinese and re-hating Russians. But this business of international propaganda by the entertainment industry is relative child's play compared to the current effort in the field of social brainwashing, which is a very tricky business, indeed.

Propaganda, by definition, is an effort to shape attitudes and incite people to action. And when it focuses its attention on a problem as complicated and delicate as race relations in the United States, it is not easy to predict exactly what attitudes and what kind of action are likely to result.

It would be one thing if the treatment of the problem consisted simply of platitudes calling for tolerance and brotherly love between the races, but it definitely does not.

Far more often, in fact, it is a matter of dramatizing and exploiting the antagonisms that are assumed to exist between the black and white communities. The content of this endlessly repeated theme, beamed into the living rooms of both communities, involves violence and hatred and sex and all the other things that sell TV shows. And it is being packaged in a racial context that has, or could have, the approximate explosive potential of uranium-235.

If there is such a thing, therefore, as a conspiracy by those who call the shots in the television industry to brainwash the public on the question of race relations, it is a conspiracy of highly questionable wisdom. The intention, no doubt is the laudable one of promoting reconciliation and harmony. But the unfortunate fact is that the actual result may be quite the contrary. The real problem is, of course, that it is hard to propagandize with the same material two different groups which are presumed to be antagonistic to each other. What leads one group to cool it may well incite the other to go on a rampage. Where the antagonism is real, it is no easy thing to please one group without infuriating the other.

In show biz as in real life, to be sure, there is an obligation to tell it like it is. There is plenty of room for social conscience and plenty of reason for changing some of the dramatic stereotypes left over from the past.

But whether problems of prejudice, injustice, resentment, and alienation are going to be solved—or even helped—by a concerted deluge of dramatic propaganda is extremely doubtful.

Dignity, after all, is not a quality that can be conferred on anyone by a TV casting director. And whether the image of the American Negro will be much improved by suddenly changing him on millions of television screens from a fall guy to a tough guy remains to be seen.

For the fact is that the American people, for all their susceptibility to propaganda cloaked as entertainment, do have a way of developing a certain sales resistance when the message is laid on hard enough. At the moment, a delicate problem is being handled with what may strike a good many viewers as sledge-hammer finesse. The time for some change in signals—and perhaps some letup in the pressure—may be at hand.

SHORT EDITORIAL ON CRIME

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, succinct and directly to the point is an editorial recently broadcast over radio station KSON in San Diego, Calif., by the station's president and general manager, Dan McKinnon. Dan is the son of our former colleague from San Diego, Clinton D. McKinnon, and I take pleasure in sharing his thoughts with the Members of the House:

SHORT EDITORIAL ON CRIME

This will probably be one of our shortest editorials.

Did you know that during 1968, no one received the death penalty for a crime in the United States.

Did you also know that the crime rate in America during 1968 reached its highest point?

Do you suppose there could be a connection between the two?

A COLLEGE LAYS DOWN SOME VALUES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the dialog continues on this serious problem of campus disorders around the country and in that regard I was interested to read of the action taken by officials at Brigham Young University to head off the troublemakers before they get started in their efforts to create chaos and disorder.

An article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones appearing in the March 1, 1969, edition of the Washington Evening Star outlines the program at Brigham Young in some detail and I was especially impressed with a statement by the president of Brigham Young, Mr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, in refusing to grant official recognition to the Students for a Democratic Society. Mr. Wilkinson's observation that, "There's nothing in my contract that says I have to be stupid," should be a clue to college administrators all over the country to read the fine print of their own contracts and they may find the same thing to be true in their own case.

I insert the column at this point in the RECORD:

A COLLEGE LAYS DOWN SOME VALUES

(By Jenkins Lloyd Jones)

Things are jumping on a lot of campuses these days, and one such campus is that of Brigham Young University out in Provo, Utah.

The academic process is roaring in high gear. The library teems with students. Twenty-one thousand young people hurry between classes. The field house is packed for basketball. And the able curator of the paleontological museum has hired a helicopter to fly him to a nearby mountain peak so that he may test out a tent of his invention which he intends to use in Antarctica.

Although it is contrary to Mormon morals to indulge in tobacco and liquor, or even tea and coffee, the dourness ends abruptly. Even the earliest "saints" loved to dance and one of the first buildings they put up in Salt Lake City was a theater. So at BYU the polished floor gleams in the ballroom. College theatricals are busy and the television laboratory is stuffed with skit writers and hopeful performers.

There are, incidentally, no pickets at the gate. The president's office is occupied by the president, not an ad hoc committee. There are no unwashed characters presenting ultimata and irreducible demands. And this is not accidental. It is by design.

Last summer BYU President Ernest L. Wilkinson sent a letter to the parents of all prospective students explaining that BYU is a very biased institution—biased in favor of good conduct, fair play and hard work. He pointed out rather bluntly that nobody had to go to BYU and that people with other aims and standards wouldn't be happy during the very short period they would spend in its environment.

"We feel," he wrote, "that to indulge irresponsible student conduct is to abdicate our role as educators, and we intend to be more exacting than ever to assure the maintenance of law and order and the development of Christian ladies and gentlemen on our campus."

Then last Sept. 26, President Wilkinson made a speech to the student body.

"The refusal of past and present students of BYU to yield to mob psychology and your

pride in the appearance of yourselves and this campus are qualities for which we salute you. You are here to build, not destroy, this university."

He asked that all who agreed with these sentiments please stand. Apparently everybody did. Then he asked for all who had contrary notions to rise. Nobody did.

Nevertheless, a few weeks later six students who said they represented the Students for a Democratic Society appeared at Wilkinson's office and asked for official recognition.

"The protestations of the SDS that it favors democratic methods," he told them, "stand in sharp contrast to repeated demonstrations where it tries to impose its will on the majority by riot, sabotage and disruption. There's nothing in my contract that says I have to be stupid. Permission refused."

I, personally, have some rather radical ideas about the right of students to be heard in university affairs. I believe that every semester students should be allowed to grade the content of their courses and the effectiveness of their professors on confidential unsigned form sheets, one copy to go to the dean and the other direct to the president.

I remember my own frustration at baloney courses fashioned out of long-dead doctoral theses and delivered by mummies. I can understand the anger that arises when the eminent professor, advertised in the catalog, never emerges from his laboratory while the course he should be teaching is presided over by a graduate assistant who is just two pages ahead of the class.

But these frustrations are not the same as the effort to canonize pot or free love, to batter down admission standards, to prance naked in student shows or to freeze on the payroll professors who counsel treason and race warfare.

Faculties and administrations which struggle to seek "meaningful dialogs" and "areas of agreement" with outfits that have plainly spelled out their determination to rule or ruin will get A for effort, but F for sophistication. If a college is to survive the cynical assaults of today it has to have the guts to lay down some value judgments.

Old Brigham Young thought he knew a sinner when he saw one. That may be why his nameless university is still happily teaching school.

THE LATE E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of Senator Bob Bartlett came as a blow not only to his constituency in Alaska but also to the host of personal friends and admirers in the Congress. Having served 14 years as a Delegate in the Congress, prior to Alaska's admission as a State, Bob was universally respected by every Member of this body who knew him. When issues related to Alaska arose, Alaska's delegate was the spokesman for that territory. He was very knowledgeable and all Members, regardless of party affiliation, looked to him for advice and guidance. He established an enviable reputation as a highly dependable source of information when Alaska problems arose.

After serving with great distinction for 7 terms, Mr. Bartlett was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1958, where he continued to serve with the added stature of his new assignment.

Bob Bartlett was a man of tremendous ability, of unquestioned integrity and dedication. He served his State and his Nation well. His loss is indeed a tragic one. I, like scores of others, regarded him as a personal friend who was always cooperative and understanding. I extend to the surviving family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SOUTH BOSTON LITHUANIANS CITIZENS ASSOCIATION

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I enclose a copy of a resolution adopted on February 16, 1969, by the South Boston Lithuanians Citizens Association in their observance of the 51st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, which resolution I am pleased to enclose in my remarks:

RESOLUTION

By the unanimous vote of the Lithuanian people of Greater Boston assembled in the Auditorium of the South Boston Lithuanian Citizens Association to commemorate the Fifty-first Anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1969, the following resolutions were adopted;

Whereas the Greater Congress of Lithuania assembled in Vilna in 1917 to demand freedom from Russia, there elected the Council of Lithuania, which, on February 16, 1918 proclaimed the Independence of Lithuania "in accordance with the recognized right of National self-determination" and asserted its restoration as an independent State, which status was thereafter recognized by all the Great Nations of the World, and marked the severance of ties of bondage by which it had been enslaved since 1795; and

Whereas this action corresponded to the American Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776 wherein it was stated: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness, and

Whereas Lithuania, the land of our ancestors, enjoyed a free and independent existence from 1919 until June, 1940, when the Soviet Union by chicanery, subversion and force invaded and occupied the country, and still oppressively rules Lithuania to this day; and

Whereas the United States of America has taken and firmly maintains the only just and honorable position of not recognizing the illegal occupation and rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by Soviet Russia; and

Whereas this year also marks the 29th year of Soviet occupation and subjugation of Lithuania; and

Whereas His Excellency, Governor Francis W. Sargent of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and His Honor, Kevin H. White, Mayor of Boston, both have proclaimed February 16, 1969 "Republic of Lithuania Day" and urged all our citizens to observe this day in tribute to the oppressed people of this brave nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved; That we again express our appreciation and gratitude to our government for its firm stand in refusing to recognize the fruits of the brutal Soviet aggression and occupation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge President Richard Nixon that in his reorganization of the De-

partment of State, he instruct his Secretary of State to include the freedom of Lithuania, and the other Baltic States, as urgent and necessary for the peace as well as that in Vietnam and Asia; and be it further

Resolved, That President Nixon instruct his Ambassador to the United Nations to place the case of Lithuania's independence before the Committee to Abolish Colonialism and the Liberation of Enslaved Nations and to insist that the Committee take positive action to establish negotiations for the freedom of Lithuania with the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States of America, to the Secretary of State, to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to our Governor Sargent and Mayor White and to the press; and be it further

Resolved, That we continue to voice our convictions for an early settlement of the Rights of all Lithuanians for independence through the Lithuanian radio and press throughout the year and until our great nation succeeds in obtaining the liberation of Lithuania.

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL
OF BOSTON,
EDMUND CIBAS, President.
JACKUS SONDA, Secretary.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of our bright scholars of tomorrow, and incidentally, my constituent, Dan Ellerman, of Winnsboro, La., delivered one of the most heart-warming, patriotic, and inspiring messages I have ever read. So that all of the Members may be privileged to read this magnificent speech on patriotism, I have received permission to insert it in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

I commend this inspiring address of indeed one of the future leaders to your attention.

Incidentally, this young man won a highly competitive contest for his speech, so it is indeed an honor for me to represent this outstanding young man in the Congress.

The speech follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Dan Ellerman)

In James Madison's notes on the signing of the Constitution, we find this entry: "Whilst the members were signing, Dr. Franklin was seen looking toward the president's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, and said, 'I have often and often, in the course of the session, looked at that behind the president without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; but now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun.'"

These optimistic words were much more than just idle talk. They expressed this great American's confidence in a fledgling republic that was to become the greatest nation in the history of the world. The noble men who helped guide our young republic through the dark days that accompanied its inception, left behind them a proud heritage and a challenge—a challenge for those of us who have followed them to keep this democracy of free men alive and strong, inviolate

against the hostile threats to its preservation.

This challenge should be especially appealing to young Americans, for we are the ones who are always searching for some goal in life, for a cause to champion. There is no better time than the present for us to begin the important process of preparing ourselves for the responsibilities peculiar to a democratic society.

Education plays a very major role in this preparation. In a democracy such as ours where the masses rule, it is necessary that the masses be educated and enlightened. For instance, during my formative years, I must prepare myself for meeting these responsibilities by acquiring a quality education that will fit me not only for my role as a productive member of society but also for my role as a contributor to the service of my country and my countrymen.

During this time in my life the doors to my mind are open wide, allowing the entry of many varied ideals and ideologies. Take the matter of dissent for example—an issue that has brought forth hot words and heated actions. Dissent is the very basis upon which this nation was founded; but I believe in dissent only within the framework of law; that is, through peaceful assembly and petition and, finally, the ballot box. Concerning dissent, I choose to follow Voltaire's philosophy: "I may not always agree with what you have to say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it!"

The character of a people determines the character of a nation. And I say let this nation be representative of a people who adhere to the precepts of honesty, justice, peace, Godliness, courage, and equality, whether they be dissenters or adherents.

In a nation such as ours, where freedom is a way of life, we often forget that the blessings of freedom are not free, that they must constantly be re-won in each successive generation. Until mankind's dream of a utopian world becomes a reality, democracy will never be without anxious moments.

The greatest danger lies not in the potential threat of an overly-zealous foreign power but in the possibility of downfall through inertia and complacency. We cannot neglect whole segments of our society, leaving them to parasitic welfarism. Instead, through compassion we must provide the avenues by which they may travel upright to a more satisfying life. The home, the school, the church—as well as the government—must be our allies in this noble dream.

If the American people truly prize their freedom, they will not stand idly by and watch their liberty destroyed. Our democracy is not without flaws; but is, in my opinion, the only form of government under which man can walk in the image of the God who created him. Like Thomas Jefferson, I believe this democracy to be, "the last best hope of mankind." I look optimistically to a future filled with promise, the promise of an enlightened, concerned, and active America, a nation that willingly accepts freedom's challenge; an America that will continue to be, as Franklin said, "a rising and not a setting sun!"

MOROCCAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, free nations of the world share a mutual pride in celebrating the independence of a sister nation. Free people all over the world share a common bond.

Today marks the national day of a historic friend of the United States—Morocco.

The friendly relations between Morocco and the United States is one which dates back to the time of our own revolution. And it is one which has grown and flourished.

His Majesty, King Hassan II, has shown that he holds the friendship of the United States in high esteem by sending His Excellency Ahmed Osman and his wife, Her Royal Highness Princess Lalla Nezha, the King's sister, to represent Morocco here.

Since arriving here, the very able Ambassador and his wife have established many friendships and have represented their country well.

I know that all my colleagues will join with me in offering our best wishes to our friends from Morocco on this, their national day.

CONGRESSMAN ABBITT ASSAILS DISTRIBUTION OF PORNO- GRAPHIC MATERIALS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with a number of my colleagues in introducing a bill designed to deal with the growing problem of pornographic material in this country.

Not only as a Member of Congress but as a parent and concerned citizen I feel that action in this direction is long overdue. Within recent years we have seen a tremendous growth in the distribution of this material and it is high time that Congress take action to keep obscene materials out of the hands of minors and in keeping minors away from obscene movies.

Under the bill it would be a violation of Federal Law to knowingly sell, offer for sale, loan, deliver, distribute, or provide to a minor in interstate commerce or through the mails, material which is defined as "harmful to minors" under the bill. It would also make it a Federal crime to knowingly exhibit to a minor a motion picture, show, or presentation which falls in the "harmful to minors" category. The bill is patterned after a New York State statute which the Supreme Court has already upheld. In the Supreme Court decision in *Ginsberg v. New York* (390 U.S. 629) it was held that a New York statute was constitutional which prohibited the sale to persons under 17 years of age materials defined to be obscene to them even though the same material might not be obscene to adults. It would appear from the Court's decision that this approach to the problem of keeping pornography out of the hands of youth would be constitutional.

Frankly, I believe that the Supreme Court has a good deal of responsibility in this field and because of some recent decisions by the Court, the business of pornographic literature and its associated evils has mushroomed.

It seems to me that in this area there is no question of Congress responsibility. We are charged with protecting the general welfare and if a choice has to be made as to whose welfare is more worth protecting, it would logically be that of our young people. Those who prey on the youth of our country in the sale and distribution of smut should be dealt with to the fullest extent of the law. Frankly I believe that the present laws could be enforced with much more vigor than they now are but this is another problem going back to the attitude of the majority on the Supreme Court. If present laws are not sufficient then a new law of the type now being proposed seems to be a minimum necessity.

I strongly urge that this Congress take action and act immediately in order to get at the core of the problem. It does little good to sit back and view the bad results of actions now being taken against our young people. We need to attack the source of the problem and it should be clear to all concerned where that action should start.

I urge that hearings be called on these bills and that Congress make clear its intent that the fabric of our society shall not be undermined by those who are purveyors of filthy and indecent presentations whether by the written word, pictures, movies, or otherwise.

CAREER POSTMASTERS

HON. MARTIN B. McKNEALLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Evening News of Newburgh, N.Y., of February 18, 1969. It is written with the skill and perception characteristic of the editorial page of this newspaper. Mr. Maurice Herbert, the editor, has been commenting over the years on the political scene. He about sums up the situation involving patronage and the post office in his concluding paragraph wherein he observes that there is no guarantee that the proposal under scrutiny if enacted will obtain longer than 4 years.

The editorial is as follows:

CAREER POSTMASTERS

The decision of the Nixon Administration to end partisan appointment of postmasters as a major channel of patronage is highly controversial.

This doesn't mean that postmasters are a bunch of misfits. There have been some highly competent postmasters, individuals who may have won their appointments originally on the basis of outstanding political service but who entered upon their duties with all the talent and desire that helped them achieve success in other offices or in party work.

Newburgh's Philip S. Levy, for instance, never looked upon his job as postmaster as a political award; it was a career upon which he entered with particular pride because his father before him had a notable career in the postal service in the same community. Experience and his innate ability produced a highly competent postmaster who surely could excel in any test given to establish

an eligibility list. There are others of like stature serving as postmasters. Alas, there are others also with less talent.

Both major parties have used the postmaster appointments as key instruments of local patronage. Under FDR this system was a major means of building a new and powerful political organization.

The Republicans enjoyed only a limited political reconstruction during the Eisenhower years. Many looked to the Nixon administration for steps to strengthen the party, whose strength has dwindled to less than 30 per cent of the popular vote.

The suggested system may be approved in the Congress, where Democrats in power may expect little patronage from a Republican president. But what makes anyone think the Democrats will not throw out any such system when, as and if they get another man in the White House?

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, Negro History Week has been observed in Los Angeles for a number of years. The special events scheduled are always interesting and informative, and are looked forward to with eager anticipation by the entire community.

The 1969 observance was the occasion for comments by the Reverend James E. Jones, president of the Los Angeles City Board of Education, in which he speaks of the value and purposes of Negro History Week.

I insert the following remarks of the Reverend Jones in the RECORD:

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK EVENTS: REVEREND JONES COMMENTS ON PURPOSES OF WEEK

The yearly observance of Negro History Week during the month of February presents a special opportunity for Americans of every ethnic origin and background to:

Emphasize both past and present accomplishments of Negroes as individuals and as members of a group.

Recognize the participation of Negro citizens in American life.

Pay particular homage to a group of Americans whose participation in our nation's development began in 1619.

Give proper attention to the Negro's African heritage.

Dr. Martin Luther King once said that "A race that has no past has only a dubious future." The Negro race has a rich and impressive history. Unfortunately, however, and partially due to the fact that textbooks in our public schools until recently have reflected only fragmentary glimpses of the deeds of Negro Americans, there was an appalling lack of knowledge of the achievements and vital contributions of our citizens toward the great progress of our nation down through the years.

For example, many people are aware of the invaluable contributions of George Washington Carver toward the agricultural progress of Dixie, the educational benefits which Booker T. Washington brought to his fellow men, the brilliant oratorical ability of Frederick Douglass and the cultural achievements of Mary McLeod Bethune, founder of Bethune-Cookman College.

But how many of our children of all ethnic groups, or grownups, too, know that Negroes invented such things as the:

Harvesting machine—William Douglas
Telephone receiver—Granville Woods

Gas mask—Garret Morgan
Automatic shoe-lasting machine—J. Ernest Metzlinger

Grooved street car rail—Elbert Robinson
Tabulating machine—Robert Pelham
Therapeutic lamp—John E. Johnson
Fountain pen—William Purvis
Parachute—H. Julian

Refrillable fuse plug—Louis Stewart of Los Angeles

Self starter on the airplane—F. Douglas Warner

Daylight moving picture machine—Arthur L. McBeth

Alarm clock—Benjamin Banneker.

Knowledge of achievements like these can be of great inspirational value to children of all ethnic groups and grownups alike. This kind of knowledge prompts pride in ourselves as well as respect from and for others. Today recognition is not necessarily focused on our traditional leaders, but also on our current leaders. Not only those who have excelled, but also the place of the average person in our daily lives.

Volumes of materials are now becoming available concerning the contributions of Negroes. There is a great availability of our successful people to give us an identification. Negroes who have achieved have found the time to return and share successes with each other.

The Negro today is beginning to take his place in the curriculum in a continuing recognition of his role through education. The start has been made. It will expand.

The day will come when these Negro Americans will be recognized in schools of all ethnic backgrounds, through curriculum materials reflecting the true place of the Negro in our history. It will come through a regular inclusion in our educational program.

It is fitting that during the month of February we observe American History Month as well as Negro History Week. Negro history is an integral and inseparable part of American history.

Interest, concern and awareness should be manifested in this important part of our history each day throughout the year.

In schools and colleges, special activities and constant interest will help all pupils and students develop a greater awareness of the role of the Negro-American in this nation's growth, strengthen the understanding that American society is composed of the contributions and interactions of many groups. It will also increase the respect for an appreciation of the dignity and worth of all people.

JOB CORPS GRADUATES OBTAIN MEANINGFUL JOBS IN BALTIMORE AREA

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note recently, in an article in the Baltimore Evening Sun, that 94 percent of Job Corps graduates returning to Baltimore are being placed in meaningful jobs, most of them in jobs related to their training. Not only that, but after 6 months, 70 percent were still on the job. We should keep in mind that many of these youngsters are only 16 and 17 years old, and it is not unnatural for them to change jobs several times before they settle down to a career. But it is obvious that the Job Corps is providing them with the kind of first-rate training that makes of them desirable

employees, not only because of their trade skills but also because they have been equipped with the social skills needed to obtain and keep a decent job. Apparently their attitude and success has had a lot to do with making the Job Corps a desirable training opportunity for other disadvantaged youth in the Baltimore area; applications were up 40 percent in January, right after leave at Christmastime for many undergoing training. I am certain that a great deal of credit also goes to the Baltimore Health and Welfare Council and the Gate-House project.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE AMERICAS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic inter-American cooperation program recently held its sixth annual conference in New York City. The subject of that conference was a most significant one—"Human Rights and the Liberation of Man in the Americas." It is all the more revealing and important because the committee which each year decides the subject of this interfaith conference, and selects the participants, is composed mostly of Latin Americans.

The opening address at this year's conference by the president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and Archbishop of Detroit, the Most Reverend John F. Dearden, was particularly inspiring, and I commend it to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

THE MODERN QUEST FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Most Rev. John F. Dearden, archbishop of Detroit, President, NCCB)

Twenty years have passed since the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It took form as humanity's reaction to the ruthlessness of Nazi Germany. In 1948, the memory of the destruction of free institutions and associations and of the callous disregard for human life, man's dignity, freedom and equality, was still vivid. Against this backdrop, the Declaration was drawn up and adopted.

Provoked as it was as a response to a brutal overriding of the rights of the human person, the Declaration has a positive and a ringing tone that is at once timeless and yet timely. It was proclaimed as "a common standard of achievement for all people and all nations . . ." It has raised hopes and expectations. They must not be frustrated.

Briefly and clearly, the thirty articles of the Declaration give expression to the rights that reside in man because of his human dignity. His rights as a person, as a member of society, as a citizen of his nation, and of the international community, are defined. Grounded in his worth and dignity as a person he is seen as the subject of rights that affect every dimension of his existence.

The historical context into which this listing of rights is to be placed, we leave for philosophers and historians to determine. But without descending to particulars, we can readily agree with the observations of former Ambassador Goldberg on this subject: "For those of us whose religious and national traditions have long since acknowledged the rights which all men derive from their divine origin, the basic ideas in the

Universal Declaration are by no means new. But the effort to promote the enjoyment of such rights among all peoples is indeed new, and it is a momentous development in human history." (The Right to be Educated, Forward.)

As we read through the Declaration of Human Rights, we are struck by the wide range of matters with which it is concerned. Beginning with the fundamental statement "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights . . ." (art. 1), it asserts that, "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status . . ." (art. 2) "The right to life, liberty and security of person (art. 3)—"all are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law." (art. 7) "Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty . . ." (art. 11) "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. (art. 12) "Everyone has the right of freedom of movement . . ." (art. 13) "the right to marry and to found a family . . ." (art. 16) "the right to own property . . ." (art. 17) "the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion . . ." (art. 18) "the right to freedom of opinion and expression . . ." (art. 19) "the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association . . ." (art. 20) "the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment . . ." (art. 23) "the right to equal pay for equal work . . ." (art. 23) "the right to form and join trade unions . . ." (art. 23) "the right to rest in leisure . . ." (art. 24) "the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family . . ." (art. 25) "the right to education . . ." (art. 26) "the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community . . ." (art. 27). "Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized (art. 28)." The listing is long and full and significant.

This is not the time nor the place to trace the different currents of thought that led to the formulation of the Declaration as we now have it. It came about through the collaboration of many persons of good will. What is noteworthy is that the Declaration was accepted as a common standard for all peoples and nations, by all but eight of the member-states of the General Assembly.

It is beyond the purpose of this talk to search out the historical antecedents of the Declaration. But it should be noted that at a meeting of the Latin American states in Chapultepec early in 1945, it was declared that one of the main purposes of the new organization of the United Nations should be the elaboration of a method of protecting human rights. And the responsibility was given to the Inter-American Juridical Committee to draw up a draft resolution. This Declaration was adopted by the American states at Bogota in 1948 prior to the completion of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I mention this simply to reflect the particular concern that was felt in this hemisphere for a declaration such as that which was adopted in 1948.

In the Declaration of Human Rights, a pattern is given that is universal in scope. It has enabled persons from every part of the world to find a common and precise expression of rights that they can understand and accept. From the very fact that this formulation exists, it has its impact on people and on governments. At the same time, it has made its influence felt on decisions and working programs of the United Nations and its agencies. And it played a subtle but important role in the legislation and prac-

tice of member-states and in the formulation of the Constitution of "new" states. The Declaration is pervasive in its effects. The very fact that it exists provides a measuring stick for the definition and the realization of human rights in every part of the world.

Of itself, the Declaration of Human Rights has no legal binding force. It is, as the Declaration itself declares, simply a "common standard for all peoples and nations". To implement the Declaration, the General Assembly adopted two Covenants, one on civil and political rights and the other on economic and social rights. These in turn are made up of "conventions", such as those on slavery, genocide, the political rights of women, racial discrimination, forced labor, discrimination in employment, the equitable payment of labor, and freedom of association. When ratified by a member-state, the effect is to have the convention become part of the domestic law. But even in these instances of ratification, enforcement rests upon public opinion of the international community and moral pressure that such opinion can generate. Parenthetically in this context, we have good reason for questioning why the United States continues to defer the ratification of at least some of these conventions.

Surely no one would question the validity of the effort to achieve full human rights for all persons. And no one would be so naive as to believe that the adoption of the Declaration of Human Rights would realize this goal of itself. The Declaration stands rather as a charter which sets a goal and at the same time will always be a standard by which we can measure progress. Its value is to a great extent educational and, to some degree, inspirational as well. It helps us to see more clearly the conditions under which the human person is entitled to live. It enables those whose eyes are dimmed by despondency, whose voices are stifled by repression, whose shoulders are bent by injustice to see a glimmer of hope. Man reaches out to his fellowman for mutual support and help. What worth and value one has achieved another aspires to. And when we kindle the fires of hope and set them so clearly within the reach of men, we must not be surprised if they are not content until they have attained them.

And yet as our Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, noted a few months ago: "There is a long road to tread in order to put into effect these Declarations of intention." The road is long and hard. And the goal is difficult of attainment. In all candor, we can look about us and see everywhere too many instances of the violation of basic human rights. To go no farther afield than the United States—a country in which providentially many of these basic rights are part of our law and our tradition—it is evident that we have not solved the problem of poverty. As a consequence, "the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality," (art. 22) that are called for so explicitly in the Declaration are not realized in all our people. Further, their right to work is not possessed by those several million Americans who are without employment. Injustices of one kind or another still are found among us. And to the degree that we tolerate their existence, we fall short of the ideals that are set before us in the Declaration of Human Rights.

And what may be said with full truth of conditions here is verified in varying degrees of other peoples as well. We must not gloss over the reality. We need to see it in all its stark grimness. It is only when we begin to measure the reality against the ideals that the Declaration sets before us, that there is hope of improvement. Perhaps more acutely than at any time in the past, men are fired by the desire to have that which is due to them as human beings. It is one of the characteristics of our time. It is as if we held be-

fore them a strong and clear image and said, this is what you are entitled to be and to have. And, as is proper, they will never be content until they have achieved that goal.

There are many agencies and institutions that have a role to play in realizing for men the rights to which they are entitled. The state, the Church, economic, cultural and educational agencies all have a part to play in the task. And there is a role, too, that is given to the individual that he cannot shirk.

To a very notable degree in our society, it is the political structure that must accept key responsibility for the achievement of human rights. It has at its disposition the instrumentalities that ensure not only individual, but political, social and international rights as well. Unless it is ordered in such a way that it works unceasingly to realize these rights for its people, it is failing in its responsibilities. And if beyond this it ruthlessly represses and violates these rights, it is false to its trust. It would be superfluous to say that the democratic processes, for all their shortcomings, represent the truly human way through which man can achieve and hold fast to his rights. The association of many persons in the task gives a greater guarantee of freedom.

In the main, the role of the Church in trying to work for human rights will fall within the total social order. After all, human rights may be identified as they are in the Declaration of Human Rights in a very abstract fashion; but they do not exist except in the concrete. And they exist in the main within political confines. But since human rights do involve a value system and since it is the function of the Church to teach values, it has a role to play. And it is all the more important in our time when the realization of these values will be achieved in great part through the political process.

The Church whether explicitly or not has a role in shaping the pattern of society. The values that find expression in the life of the people owe much to the Church. Certainly many of the characteristics that distinguish the United States have religious foundations. "In a very fundamental sense, religion has helped (in Paul Ramsey's terms) provide directions but not directives to political society." (The Right to be Educated, p. 12) In a more particularized fashion, the Church exercises its influence through helping to shape the individual's value structure and in offering to the individual the inspiration and motivation to help determine the policies of his nation. In a society such as ours, individuals and groups of individuals act politically to influence policies and to shape attitudes. But they do this out of a particular kind of conviction. And not infrequently what motivates them is religious in its origin. For instance, the Catholic who out of religious convictions works toward promoting a more generous foreign-aid program is giving expression to his sense of concern for his fellowmen. In the process, he is inspired by religious motivation to further a political program that has in intent at least a very human goal.

In so many instances, it will be the voice of the Church that will have to censure the political structure for its failures in the area of human concern. Priorities that call for substantial outlays for military armaments when people lack basic human necessities must be protested against. A disregard of the truly human concerns of people will call for strong dissent. St. Augustine reminds us that material goods are permanent occasions of discord between men, while spiritual goods tend to unite men.

And yet while the Church can do much, it will remain true that a truly dynamic effort to achieve human rights will entail a collaboration of many individuals. Everyone must accept responsibility for helping to create the conditions, political, economic, social, cultural, in which all human rights can be respected and promoted. The interdepend-

ence of all members of the human community for the realization of the individual's rights, particularly in the economic and social spheres, is becoming more and more clear. We cannot evade responsibility. We are all involved.

Other papers to be given later in this Conference will be concerned with specific areas of concern. For this reason, it is not fitting that I address myself to them. But in the broad context of the quest for human rights, it is not possible to overlook certain basic facts that center in the theme of development. Many things are being done in its name. Much that is good; and much that is harmful. Certainly I would not attempt to justify some of the policies and the procedures of some of our business institutions which directly affect the achievement of rights for great numbers in Latin America. The great reservations that are had by so many in Latin America on the way in which these activities are conducted demand that we pause and re-examine the things that we are doing. The mistrust that has been engendered is due in great part to a concern on the part of those in Latin America that these enterprises are hostile to their legitimate human interests.

Certainly any work, any activity, any program that is undertaken in the name of development must be grounded upon the basic recognition of human rights. Unless they respect these rights and help to promote them and bring them to fuller achievement, they cannot be justified. It is for this reason that development—which is not simply an economic reality, but psychological, cultural, moral and political as well—must be grounded upon the bedrock of human rights. It must find its inspiration in a recognition of these rights. It must be pointed directly toward furthering these rights. And it must constantly work with the people involved to see whether or not a more human existence is being attained through these efforts. This is the touchstone of the worth of development. In reality, the term "development" probably should be qualified in almost all its uses by the adjective "human". Unless it contributes to the advance and the fulfillment of the human person, it has missed its mark.

At the last meeting of the Latin American bishops joined together in Celam in Medellin, there was evident a real sense of Christian awareness of the values that are involved in the progress of their people. A sense of Christian concern impelled them to recognize clearly the realities of the situation, to appraise strengths and weaknesses, and to propose a program of action that will help to achieve for all their people a more human existence. We applaud them for their candor, their honesty, their integrity and their pastoral zeal. And in spirit we associate ourselves with them in their efforts to bring to their people a fuller realization of their human dignity.

In the hard realities of our times, pronouncements and statements come and go in rapid succession. Sometimes they represent a faint, feeble call in the dark night of injustice and inhumanity. They are rarely heeded by those to whom they are addressed; they bring little hope to those in whose cause they are spoken. So often, they are gestures in futility.

And yet, from time to time, something is said or written that quickens the spirit of man. It buoys up his hopes. It gives direction to his strivings. It raises him as a man. Such were the great social encyclicals of Pope John XXIII, "Pacem in Terris" (Peace on Earth), and Pope Paul VI, "Populorum Progressio" (On the Development of Peoples). They have been beacons, lighting the course of the Church in its effort in our time to be of service to all mankind.

Though of different inspiration, the Uni-

versal Declaration on Human Rights is, and will continue to be, a high watermark in human advancement. It has set a standard that we must somehow strive to attain. In comparison with its goals, some of our efforts seem puny and futile. The chasm between what is and what ought to be is so wide and so fearsome. But it must be bridged. The many strong hands and sturdy hearts that unite in trying to bring to all men what will make them more truly human are carrying forward a work of God. Many persons of good will have a part in this task. We who share the blessings of our Christian faith bring to the task a special insight and motivation. Our very sharing in the life of God lays upon us a special duty to be involved. The achievement of human rights demands the fire and the warmth and the dynamic strength and the hope of Pentecost. We must set ourselves to the task with courage and with confidence "... in the power of the Holy Spirit ...". (I Peter, 1: 12)

WHY THE ISRAELIS HIT BACK SO HARD

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East is a matter of grave concern to us all. Miss Carol Kovner is managing editor of Kovnor Publications, Los Angeles, and I have entered several of her firsthand reports on the Middle East situation into the RECORD during past weeks.

The latest article, entitled "Why the Israelis Hit Back So Hard," discusses the reasons behind Israel's retaliatory raids against the Arab States. Special consideration is given to the significance of terrorist attacks on Israel civilian aircraft.

The article follows:

WHY THE ISRAELIS HIT BACK SO HARD (By Carol Kovner)

The United States is asking, why do the Israelis retaliate so hard, so "out of proportion" to Arab attacks? Why did the Israelis destroy 13 aircraft in Beirut for one dead Israeli and one damaged plane in Athens by Arab terrorists?

Let's try and answer this question. First, some background which the Arab and Communist blocs never mention in their propaganda and the Western Nations seldom take into account when Israeli military actions startle them.

A few months ago an El Al jet passenger liner was hijacked from Rome and kidnapped to Algeria. It took 40 days to get it released. One man was wounded, and the others not treated too gently according to the pilot.

Again, last week on Thursday, December 26th, another El Al passenger air liner was attacked in a foreign airport by Arab terrorists, this time with grenades and machine guns, with the obvious intention of incinerating all civilian passengers on board. The plane was put out of commission, one passenger was killed and several wounded including two stewardesses. Leon Shirdan was shot four times in the head. He was on a consultant assignment to the UN in his capacity as a port engineer expert in Haifa. (One of the terrorists on Monday told his questioners he did not intend to kill.)

Both these attacks on Israel's civil aviation were the work of a terrorist organization based in Lebanon. Abba Eban told the Israeli cabinet on Sunday, December 29, the day following the Israeli raid on Beirut airport.

The Arab terrorists had come to Athens Airport bent on attacking a plane filled with passengers. It was a miracle there was no massacre. The Lebanese government had come out in support of the attack, while the organs of all Arab governments had heaped praise upon the murderers.

The United States position is that it opposes holding the Lebanese government responsible for the terrorist attack. It noted that the Lebanese government was considered moderate in the Middle East and besides, the two terrorists had been captured and would stand trial. This was conveyed by the American Ambassador Walworth Barbour.

The UN representative, James Russell Wiggins, said in the UN Security Council that Israel's attack on the Beirut Airport would be condemned by the United States, for two reasons. One, the degree of destruction involved and two, the force of soldiers which acted under government orders. He emotionally appealed to Israel to apologize to Lebanon for the attack. He did not ask Lebanon or the Palestinian terrorists to apologize to Israel, for the Athens murder of Leon Shirdan.

Abba Eban countered to these charges in his Cabinet report that it was absurd to claim the terrorists operate in isolation. (Time Magazine proved that they had the support of and protection of host countries in their December 15 edition with a special cover article on Arafat, a leader of the terrorists.)

They operate under the wing of the Arab governments, the Lebanon included, which daily proclaim enthusiastic support, training them in their armed forces, financing them and giving them protection, Eban said.

After the Cabinet meeting, at which the Defense Minister and Chief of Staff also reported, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol said it was clear that the Athens terrorists had operated out of Beirut, that their headquarters for the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine is in Beirut and that the announcement of the raid came from Beirut.

Why did Israel strike back so hard destroying \$100 million in civil aircraft, half of Lebanon's air freight? (No deaths.) This for one Israeli life and damaged air liner.

It is the accumulation of 21 incidents since August 6 of this year involving Lebanese border crossings by terror gangs at the cost of several Israeli civilian and army forces lives, as well as property damage.

It is the hijacking of her air liner to Algeria by terrorists that are trained in bases in Tripoli, Sidon and Tyre.

It is the raid in Athens that threatens her freedom of air navigation. It is this that breaks the patience of Israel with a so-called moderate neighbor.

There is no other country on earth that is expected to let its neighbors wage war on her while she is told by the United States and other Western nations not to respond in her own defense, and even to apologize.

In Vietnam, the US sent her own soldiers to stop terrorists from invading a country and has fought a bitter, wearisome and bloody war for years in the protection of the right of South Vietnam to live without attacks from the north.

If, for example, a neighboring country sent terrorist raiders into Alaska to sabotage farms and roads and water pipes, and blow up railroads, bus stations and market places, would the US ignore this? If the attacks got to the point where this neighboring country attacked our airlines, trying to blow them up with passengers inside in a foreign airport, would we consider it "unwise" to take action against them, as President Johnson has called the Israeli retaliation in Beirut?

If you try the shoe on the other foot, the picture can sometimes be clearer. A free country cannot stand by and let its citizens be murdered willy-nilly. The US would not take it, why should Israel?

Israeli government circles understood well what the Beirut attack would cost them in

world opinion, but they feel the terrorists' one aim is to destroy Israel. Unless the governments who harbor them stop them, Defense Minister Moshe Dayan says the commando raids in Beirut, Jordan and Egypt will remain a new dimension in Israeli policy.

RUSSIA TESTING ADVANCED ROCKET

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, according to a story in the Baltimore Sun of March 3, the Soviet Union is going right ahead with its testing of an advanced defense rocket for its anti-ballistic-missile system while U.S. officials continue to argue the pros and cons of whether to construct such a system.

It will be remembered that controversy has accompanied the ABM issue for a number of years now, with Congress and the Joint Chiefs of Staff favoring an ABM defense system with former Defense Secretary McNamara opposing it. At one point Secretary McNamara and the Johnson administration sought to persuade the Soviets to agree not to escalate an ABM race. Later, it was judged expedient that we begin work on a "thin" ABM system for defense against Red China. Now, it seems, we are back to debating once again.

The Baltimore Sun article, by Charles W. Corddry, of the Washington bureau of the Sun, states that the Soviet weapon is reported to be able to intercept attacking missiles at distances of about 100 to 450 miles from its launch site. It is believed that the Soviet rocket is comparable with our Spartan interceptor which has been proposed for our ABM system.

I include the above-mentioned item, "Russia Testing Advanced Rocket," from the March 3 issue of the Baltimore Sun in the RECORD at this point:

RUSSIA TESTING ADVANCED ROCKET (By Charles W. Corddry)

Washington, March 2.—The Soviet Union has been test-firing an advanced defense rocket that appears to be comparable with the long range Spartan interceptor planned for use in America's anti-ballistic missile system.

Authorities who reported this today said the most recent test of the Soviet missile was conducted in mid-February. The weapon is reported to be able to intercept attacking missiles at distances of about 100 to 450 miles from its launch site.

At the same time, the Russians reported to be making equivalent progress on phased array radar like that in the American ABM system. Judged essential for swift detection and handling of several attacking missiles at once, this type of radar has beams that are steered electronically. There are no mechanically rotating antennas.

SEVERAL PROBES GOING

These new intelligence assessments are expected to figure importantly in forthcoming congressional consideration of the anti-ballistic missile question. At least a half dozen committees are investigating this controversial issue.

Questions immediately are raised as to how far the Soviet Union will be willing to go in

limiting anti-ballistic missile deployments when Washington and Moscow come to discuss arms limitation.

Regarding the Soviet interceptor missile, it is understood that there have been tests on several occasions at least since last August. There appears to be enough data in hand on the mid-February shot to confirm the suppositions from the earlier tests.

NEW INFORMATION

It is this new information that Melvin R. Laird, Defense Secretary, would appear to have had in mind when he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee February 20 about a new Russian ABM system.

Proponents of the American Sentinel system have said that arms talks with Russia might result in agreement to limit anti-missile defenses to the types needed for defense against China. Some sources question whether that much agreement is attainable, however, on the speculation that Moscow might be unwilling to risk Chinese and other Communist accusations of conspiring with the "imperialists" on the missile defense issue.

AGREES WITH CLIFFORD

In his Senate testimony, Secretary Laird said he agreed with his predecessor, Clark M. Clifford, that the Soviet Union had slowed its "Galosh" missile program around Moscow.

But he added at once that he believed the slowdown was linked with "recent information which we have had on research and development activities in testing of a new sophisticated ABM system."

Mr. Clifford said just before leaving office January 20 that the significance of the "Galosh" slowdown had not yet been determined—a statement that indicates how "recent" Mr. Laird's information is.

DR. JOHN E. KETO: AN OUTSTANDING GOVERNMENT SCIENTIST

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Dr. John E. Keto, of Dayton, Ohio, an outstanding Government scientist who retired on Friday after more than 33 years of service to the Nation.

Dr. Keto was the Chief Scientist of the Aeronautical Systems Division of the Air Force Systems Command, located at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. He was promoted to that position in 1959 while a member of ASD's predecessor, the Wright Air Development Center.

During his career as a public servant, John Keto has earned a national and international reputation for his knowledge, ability, and imagination. His contributions have been in the important areas of research, development, management, and test.

Starting with his early efforts in radar technology, he worked to further the development and application of increased capabilities in such fields as bionics, secondary power sources, electric propulsion, surveillance, infrared, data processing, and micromolecular electronics.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, he has played a key role in the creation and maintenance of American technical superiority in the aerospace field.

There are many John Ketos at Wright

Field and at other Government research installations around the country whose devotion to duty and expertise are invaluable to the United States. These men could reap higher monetary rewards outside of Government service but they have chosen not to. In lieu of financial gains, they are satisfied to be a part of maintaining the security of the Nation.

In expressing my admiration for Dr. John Keto, Mr. Speaker, I also honor his associates.

Since I will be unable to be present at this Friday's observance of Dr. Keto's retirement in Dayton, I wish at this time to extend my best wishes to him and his wife.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest.

This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The theme chosen for this contest was "Freedom's Challenge."

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging and I am most proud of the winning contestant from our great State of New Jersey, for it happens to be a student from my own congressional district. The winning speech was delivered by Miss Barbara E. Marty, 157 Schraalenburgh Road, Haworth, N.J.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD the text of Miss Marty's speech and commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

It always is reassuring to me to read the thoughts of young Americans such as Miss Marty and realize what high regard they have for the freedom we in America enjoy.

The speech follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Barbara Marty)

"To see the world in a grain of sand"; your world; my world; our world in which we are free to do as we please. We walk the streets of a great city unhampered by laws dictating our freedom. Our freedom, restrained by the Constitution of the United States, is given to us. Our priceless gift is given, without question, to us. This jewel, coveted by its worth, is beyond limitations. Yet our gift is not a wise one for many. Those who take their freedom and throw it into the muddy gutters and trample its sacred name into the ground, those who abuse it and those who worship it are all equal under its protecting smile.

The right to be free, although given to us, is costly. Many lives have been spent to maintain freedom. The path is difficult and unless the courage to face the obstacles is present, we fail. Victory will not be complete until we no longer have to fight for freedom. Our forefathers fought for their freedom just as we fight for ours and the freedom of others today. When will the time come when man can be assured that his freedom will never be jeopardized? How long will we have

to wait to insure absolute freedom for our children and their children? When will our struggles end?

Freedom, its unadulterated, manifest beauty is veiled from those unwilling to sacrifice their worldly wants. The freedom to be free is unalienable yet so many are denied it. The gates are open. All that is necessary is faith in the way of the right, courage to withstand any challenge and prayers in the hope that the Lord will guide us in our quest.

Freedom is like the rapid streams that travel wherever they please. Freedom is a city filled with bustling enterprises. Freedom is a newborn, free to mature into an adult, knowing only to be free.

I sit here wondering what it is like not to be free; not to do as I wish; not to be able to plan my life. I think of the many thousands of children who know not of what I speak but who must bear this burden of unknowing grief.

Although numerous, the symbols for the many facets of freedom can be brought to light through the use of the colors of the rainbow. White is the color of purity. Pure is our hope that freedom survives. That this most precious of all rights remains in the palms of our descendants. That they shall guard it as fiercely as we have.

Blue is the color of love and honor; love for our nation; love for the principles on which our nation establishes her beliefs. To honor our laws and revere our Flag are the basis of freedom.

Red, is the color of blood. The blood and toil and sweat that men have given to preserve this freedom is worth more than can be dreamed. Those who would challenge our freedom must face proud warriors who zealously protect what is ours.

Orange is the color of religion. Only by the Grace of our Lord, the "Warden of all men", may we attain our most sought-for desires. The way is hard but our religious codes are worthless without the challenge.

Indigo represents patriotism. We who defend the freedom of our world are patriots. We are loyal to the cause of the end result we seek.

Freedom, in its most pristine form does not exist in our world today. Freedom is only indirectly known. Freedom, our sole great need is beyond our grasp. Therefore, freedom is the most urgent condition for which we must strive. Freedom, at all costs, must be won.

"To see the world in a grain of sand." Walk along the sea one day. Gaze at the majesty of the rising blue waters. Know that freedom is a God-given gift; that we who walk this earth are given, the right, to be free.

TRIBUTE TO MINNIE PEARL

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in these times of extreme stress both at home and throughout the world, I would like to take a few moments to call attention to someone who personifies the qualities in life which are so sadly lacking in our society of today. I refer to a very gracious lady with the simple name of Minnie Pearl. This is a name that is known and respected wherever the music of America's heartland is played.

In the highly competitive entertainment world, where stars rise and fall with remarkable speed, Minnie Pearl has remained a star of the first magnitude year after year. The reasons for her continued

success lie not only with her talents as an entertainer, but also in her philosophy and the consideration she shows to those around her. It is said the power of television is its ability to reveal the true person before the camera. This is the reason Minnie Pearl is a welcome guest in millions of American homes whenever she makes a television appearance.

Minnie Pearl was born in Centerville, Tenn., deep within the wellsprings of Americana. The youngest of five daughters, she grew up in a warm, secure family, and attended Ward-Belmont College before giving any thought to becoming an entertainer. While teaching school she began taking part in amateur theatrical productions and developed the comic style that was to make her a star. She found that one of the great pleasures in life is to hear people laugh, and this encouraged her to enter the entertainment world.

She created her character by taking two of the most classic country names and combining them into a personality who had not existed before. She had only one basic rule for Minnie Pearl to follow, and that was that humor must always be kind humor.

During the years that followed, she continued to develop the character of Minnie Pearl by drawing upon the people she met in her travels. Radio made her a star, but she had the discipline to retain the basic qualities that were to be so vital to her continued success.

In addition to her success in the field of entertainment, she is also actively engaged in the development of an international franchised restaurant chain that bears her name, providing employment and economic opportunity for a large number of people. She is also active in charitable causes, never forgetting the obligations to society instilled by her family and community.

Today Minnie Pearl is actually three people—business woman, entertainer, and most important, a devoted wife to Mr. Henry Cannon. Despite her fame and fortune, she continues to live but a few miles from where she was born. It is indeed gratifying to pay tribute to this remarkable lady.

MOSCOW ON TERRORISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we recognize the direct relationship between the Soviet Union and the activities of certain groups within the Arab world.

The Sunday Star in a very concise and effective editorial commentary, March 2, points out the involvement of the Soviet Union in the Middle East tension:

MOSCOW ON TERRORISM

Looked at in any light, the Arab terrorist attacks on Israeli passenger jetliners in Athens and Zurich were barbarous crimes, and they have been properly condemned as such by peoples and governments throughout the world.

A striking exception, however, is the Kremlin. After weeks of silence on the subject, it now has come out in defense of the attacks. In a statement issued by Tass, it has accused Israel of "abominable provocations" that have made hit-and-run guerrilla forays—against marketplaces, school buses, farm settlements, planes and the like—quite permissible and "just" in terms of international law. Further, speaking through Pravda, the Soviet leadership has hailed the jetliner shoot-ups as brave work "carried out by patriots." As for Israel's reprisals against terrorist bases, such as those in Syria, they are "bandit-like . . . acts of undisguised aggression."

Thus, in effect, the Soviet government has bestowed its official blessing on Al Fatah and all other Arab guerrilla and commando groups, implicitly encouraging them on to further deeds of violence. To say the least, this is an appallingly poor way to help defuse the Middle East and create a promising atmosphere for Anglo-French-American-Soviet talks aimed at establishing peace there.

But perhaps no one should be surprised that terrorism is endorsed by a system born of it and reared in its omnipresent shadow.

DR. BERTRAM A. BETTS RETIRING AS CHIEF DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY SCHOOLS

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on March 6 Dr. Bertram A. Betts is retiring as chief deputy superintendent of schools for the county of Los Angeles after a long and distinguished career.

It is largely due to the outstanding contributions of educators and administrators such as Dr. Betts that we have such a high quality education system in Los Angeles County.

Dr. Betts has been in public education in Los Angeles County since being graduated from La Verne College in 1925. He was principal of the Canyon School in Azusa from 1925 to 1927. He taught at Emerson Junior High School in Pomona from 1927 to 1933 and served for 10 years as principal.

From 1943 to 1945, Dr. Betts was a member of the National Staff of the American Red Cross, serving as director of the Junior Red Cross of the Pacific area.

Dr. Betts pursued graduate study both at Claremont College, Claremont, Calif., and the University of Southern California, and from 1945 to 1946 was engaged full time in doctoral studies at the University of Southern California.

In September of 1946 Dr. Betts joined the Los Angeles County superintendent's staff as special services coordinator, and was appointed assistant superintendent in September 1947. He was appointed chief deputy superintendent January 1, 1967, and served as acting county superintendent of schools from July to October 1967.

In recognition of his eminent contribution to the field of public education and of his personal dedication to the progress of children in learning, he was awarded

an honorary LL.D. degree by La Verne College in 1957.

Dr. Betts has devoted his life to working as an educator, administrator, and public servant. We have been most fortunate to have had such an outstanding leader in the Los Angeles County school system.

I am happy to have this opportunity to join in expressing thanks to Dr. Betts, to commend him for his fine record of service, and to wish him a very enjoyable retirement.

COUNTRYSIDE DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2½ years, a very considerable amount of time and large number of words have been used in regard to the future role or hope of the countryside.

The present status of our rural areas economically and socially has finally been acknowledged by both political parties. Up to now, each person who has spoken or written on this subject, and of the possibilities of using the countryside forces or assets, have had to do so as an individual and from his individual viewpoint. I believe it is way past time when our best national efforts should be made to define the problem affecting our countryside and to come up with a coordinated set of recommended procedures to make greater use of the people, land, water, highways, fresh clean air, and public facilities already in the countryside. It is for this reason, plus the need to have a common understanding of the problems and opportunities, that I am introducing my bill to establish a Countryside Commission.

This bill sets up a Commission composed of 24 members, to be appointed by the President, from the nominees as presented by the Governors within the geographical areas as are established by the farm credit districts. The life of this Commission is for 2 years or 60 days after making their report.

The countryside is defined in the bill as any land area and people who are not listed within the standard metropolitan statistical areas as defined by the Bureau of the Budget. This would include some 60 million people, a majority of the total small businessmen in the United States, over 3 million farmers, 16,000 cities and villages under 15,000 population, and over 3 million miles of all-weather hard-surfaced roads.

The President has already created a Council on Urban Affairs, whose prime duty is to deal with the acute problems of congestion and overworked public facilities and accompanying problems of our cities. Let us now create a nearly equivalent group of the highest stature to work at finding the solution to those problems besetting our countryside, so that a coordinated and balanced program can be developed.

THE APPA WORKS TO LESSEN ENVIRONMENTAL HARM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, growing public interest and concern over the quality of the environment has prompted certain citizens and organizations to stress the importance of enhancing environmental conditions. One such activity which deserves special commendation is the awards program announced last May by the American Public Power Association.

Electric power facilities—distribution and transmission lines, switching stations and the related equipment—have a substantial impact on the esthetic environment of our communities. By making such facilities as attractive as possible, the industry can minimize their adverse impact and contribute to the overall quality of environment. This fact is recognized by the APPA awards program for utility design. Emphasizing multidisciplinary approaches to design solutions, this competition enlists the cooperation of the American Institute of Architects, American Institute of Planners, American Society of Civil Engineers, and American Society of Landscape Architects. A jury consisting of nationally prominent members of these organizations, is meeting today to select winners in the contest.

Among factors to be considered by this panel are: First, community benefits supplied by the project; second, compatibility of the project with environment and city planning; third, adaptation of design to necessary mechanical and electrical equipment; fourth, architectural excellence of design; fifth, landscape development; and sixth, fulfillment of the functional purpose of the project.

Awards will be given next May in the categories of electric utility buildings, generation stations, substations, transmission structures and lines, distribution structures and lines, and other electric utility property.

APPA should be commended on their enthusiastic support of efforts to improve the esthetic appearance of electric facilities. This awards program should focus increased attention on the importance of attractive electric facilities to a community. I would like to insert at this point the APPA press release describing the awards program and announcing the jury:

APPA AWARDS PROGRAM

Four distinguished judges will participate March 3 in a panel to determine winners of the first biennial American Public Power Association "Awards Program for Utility Design." Winners of this competition—the only contest in the Nation emphasizing the importance of beautification of electric utility property—will be announced in May at the APPA annual conference to be held in Washington, D.C.

Awards will be given for projects achieving excellence of design and completed before January 1, 1968, in the categories of electric utility buildings, generation stations, substations, transmission structures and lines, dis-

tribution structures and lines, and other electric utility property. Utility managers and participating architect, planner, engineer, and/or landscape architect will receive awards for each winning project.

Participating organizations, which will co-sign awards certificates, indicate the multidisciplinary approach to design stressed by this awards program. The American Institute of Architects, American Institute of Planners, American Society of Civil Engineers, and American Society of Landscape Architects, respectively, designated the following jurors:

Francis D. Lethbridge, of the award-winning Washington, D.C., architectural firm of Keyes, Lethbridge, and Condon, is a fellow of the American Institute of Architects and former president of the Washington-Metropolitan Chapter of AIA. His firm has received numerous architectural awards, including AIA First Honor Award and Awards of Merit, AIA Potomac Valley Chapter Biennial Awards in Architecture, and Washington Board of Trade Architectural Awards.

Jeremiah D. O'Leary, Jr., Principal of the Washington Planning and Urban Development firm of Marcou, O'Leary and Associates, is a full member of the American Institute of Planners. He was formerly on the urban studies staff of the Office of Program Policy, U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, served as Principal Planner of the Planning Council of the Greater Baltimore Committee, and was a visiting critic at Harvard University. Marcou, O'Leary, and Associates have been consultants for city planning, urban renewal, and model cities programs, in cities throughout the country, including plans in New Orleans, Louisiana, for historic preservation of the French Quarter.

Eugene Weber, District V director for American Society of Civil Engineers, was formerly Deputy Director of Civil Works for Policy in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He received the Exceptional Civilian Service Award, Department of the Army, in 1963; the Rockefeller Public Service Award in 1963; and the Distinguished Civilian Service Award, Department of Defense, in 1964. Mr. Weber is currently engaged in consulting practice in Washington, D.C.

Philip H. Lewis, Jr., Chairman of the Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Wisconsin, participated in the White House Conference on Natural Beauty and on Prince Philip's Conference on the Countryside, 1970. He is the author of numerous articles, books, and reports, and received an award for the best professional paper from the American Society of Landscape Architects Quarterly in 1964. Mr. Lewis was elected to Council of Harvard Graduate School of Design Alumni in 1966. He served as co-chairman of Wisconsin Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty, served on the Hawaiian and New Jersey Governors' Conferences on Natural Beauty, and is presently a member of the American Right of Way Association Committee.

American Public Power Association is a national service organization representing 1,400 local public power systems in 47 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For further information on the APPA "Awards Program for Utility Design" contact Cathy Lichtenberg, 2600 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037 (202 333-9200).

SALMON RESOURCES FACE THREAT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the February 1969 issue of American Forests magazine carried an article by Mr. Wil-

liam E. Towell describing the threat posed to our salmon fisheries resources by proposed dams on the Middle Snake River. So that my colleagues may be informed of the dire threat posed to our fisheries resources by the proposed dams, I include the text of Mr. Towell's article at this point in the RECORD:

LO THE POOR SALMON: OR IS THIS DAM NECESSARY?

(By William E. Towell)

Conservationists recently were disheartened by the announcement of a three-way agreement between two major northwest power companies and the Department of the Interior on a proposal to seek early Congressional authorization for a multi-purpose dam on the Middle-Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. Assurances that this agreement averted early issuance of a license to build a dam by the Federal Power Commission were only mildly encouraging. Anyway you look at it another dam would spell more trouble for salmon and steelhead trout. These poor fish have an uncontrollable biological urge to spawn in fresh water, to spend part of their life cycle in the ocean and then return to the place they were hatched to spawn and die.

The salmon must undergo unbelievable hardships to carry out its life mission. Its eggs are sought after by innumerable water feeding varmints. Young salmon are prey to every carnivorous animal in the river. They must travel hundreds, even thousands, of miles to reach the ocean where they feed and grow to maturity. Then, they must return through polluted bays and estuaries, fight their way upstream against currents of warm and silt-laden waters, sewage discharges, oxygen deficiencies, dams, fish ladders, nets and spears, even clubs, until they reach that one gravel bar high in the mountains where their own life began.

The migration of anadromous fish is itself a mystery, but how they have withstood the obstacles placed in their path throughout the Columbia and Snake River systems is a miracle. One more straw might be more than a "humpback" salmon can carry. Another dam, just one more fish ladder, swift currents below high speed generators, or just a few degrees increase in water temperature could be the final blow to the salmon fishery.

Now that the Pacific Northwest Power Company, the Washington Public Power Supply System and the Interior Department are in agreement, it could mean that another dam on the Middle-Snake River is a probability, almost a certainty. Fortunately, it would be above the mouth of the Salmon River, one of the finest remaining salmon streams in the Columbia River system. Conservationists have fought long and hard to prevent construction of the Nez Perce Dam below the Salmon on the Snake River. But even a dam above the confluence of the Snake and Salmon Rivers could have disastrous consequences.

The proposed High Mountain Sheep Dam would block access to the Imnaha River, another fine salmon stream. It would require a reregulating structure at China Garden below the mouth of the Salmon River, possibly with as much adverse effect as Nez Perce itself.

Either High Mountain Sheep Dam or Appaloosa Dam, another proposed site above the mouth of the Imnaha River, could spell disaster to the salmon fishery.

Frankly, it isn't worth the risk. With all the new developments in thermo-nuclear power, surely some alternative to another dam on the Middle-Snake can be found. In spite of the arguments supporting the efficiency of hydro-electricity for peaking power and all the energy going to waste in a fast-flowing stream like the Snake River, there are some things that are irreplaceable. We

cannot afford to gamble any further with the Columbia River salmon fishery.

Few persons realize the beauty and ruggedness of the Middle-Snake River itself. Deeper than the Grand Canyon, this turbulent river flows between steep cliffs and spectacular scenery considered by many to be the most beautiful in the West. It has been proposed as one of the first additions to our new system of National Rivers under a law passed by the 90th Congress. Senators Len Jordan and Frank Church of Idaho have advocated a ten-year moratorium on any more Snake River dams. Any proposal that would rule out further damming of this river would be welcomed.

If the agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the power companies implies a reprieve or delay in authorization of a dam, as announced, it would be welcomed, but with everyone in accord as to location, either High Mountain Sheep or Appaloosa dams became frightening possibilities. Conservationists hope that the new Congress will act promptly to safeguard this mighty river. There should be no more dams on the Snake River. Since salmon cannot speak, we must speak for them.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. More than 400,000 students participated in this contest this year.

I am proud to announce that of the 50 young people who will come to Washington representing their States, John O'Brien, of West Palm Beach, will represent Florida.

At this time I would like to include in the RECORD the speech which Mr. O'Brien wrote entitled "Freedom's Challenge." I think it is a very meaningful speech which will have interest for all of my colleagues:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

America has for all of its history defended its freedom against an onslaught of challenges. Our people fought against the tyranny of King George, who challenged our freedom; the pirates of the Mediterranean, who denied us freedom of the seas; the terror of slavery which denied freedom to so many; the tyranny and oppression of Hitler and the Nazis; and today the growing threat of communism. All of these challenges we have so far met successfully.

But today we face what is perhaps the greatest challenge the world has ever known. It is not a visible challenge, and it does not exist in a foreign country. This challenge exists here at home: It exists in each and everyone of us to some degree. The greatest challenge to freedom in our country today is the apathy of our own people.

There are too many people in this nation who have adopted a "Let George do it" attitude. Today it seems that when there is a piano to move everyone wants to carry the stool. In our country there are too many people who just don't care.

Why is this a challenge? Because of the effects this apathy has brought about. Those age old qualities of love of country and of flag seem to exist no more. The American virtue of patriotism is seemingly going. To-

day, the American Flag, which for nearly two hundred years has stood for Justice, Equality, and Freedom is now spat upon, torn, and burned. And what hurts most of all, is that the people desecrating the flag are not communists or fascists, but merely misguided young Americans. Our leaders are no longer respected, but are often regarded with hatred; and we wonder why? Because people do not care. The Star Spangled Banner is something they play at the beginning of a baseball game and that's all it is today.

How can we combat this apathy in our country today? There are two courses open to us. The first course of action open to us is this: We must foster patriotism in our nation, by our own example, primarily. We must show that love of country is not something to be ashamed of. We must take the first step. We do not need speeches now, but action.

If we live as true Americans, everyday of our lives, then those around us will certainly learn what a true American really is. If we exhibit the qualities which made this country great, then those around us will learn what qualities we must possess to make this country even greater. However, the process does not stop here. In our schools, from Kindergarten to College, we must assure that a true picture of our country is presented. We must assure that our educational system fosters patriotic activity, and then provides an opportunity for the exercise of that patriotic activity. Our schools must lay the foundation for the construction of good Americans. Once the foundation has been established, it is then our example which will enact the actual construction of good Americans. We must show people what freedom is and how it works. And once this has been done we need never again witness an American destroying an American flag, never again will a soldier, who has risked his life in the defense of freedom, be called a pig or a fascist on his return home. And never again will we witness the obstruction of the president's car in a motorcade.

It is indeed a mammoth task. It will take blood, sweat, tears, and hard work, and perhaps more than anything else it will take time. But it's worth it. The freedom of our country has been preserved against the challenges of the past. I am confident that the American People can meet this new challenge successfully. But only if we act.

Of course, there is always the second course of action, we could just sit back, and look at what is happening in our country today, and we could yawn. The choice is ours.

WANTED: TRUTH IN RENTING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing the Truth-in-Renting Act, a bill that will bolster the bargaining position of the tenant in his negotiations with the landlord. The aim of this legislation is to promote the right of prospective tenants to full and accurate information regarding rental contracts. The provisions of this bill will cover only those apartments contained in multifamily rental housing where the mortgage guarantee insurance is held by the Federal Housing Administration.

I liken a prospective tenant to the consumer who has recently gained a modest degree of assistance in his purchasing ac-

tivities by the Truth-in-Packaging Act and the prospective borrower who should soon be getting an even break with the enactment of the truth-in-lending bill. Both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson time and time again enunciated that the right to be informed lies at the very heart of a buyer-seller relationship, and it is this principle which underlies my proposed legislation.

It is my conviction that the prospective tenants, as well as prospective purchasers and prospective borrowers, are all well equipped to make economic value judgments, providing they have in their possession accurate, honest, and complete information about the prospective contract.

In brief, this bill will assist prospective tenants, in multifamily rental housing in which the FHA is the insurer of the mortgage, by making it mandatory on behalf of the owner to include in an advisory memorandum attached to the rental application and lease agreement: First, all relevant information concerning FHA-approved rent schedules; and, second, a brief, simple and clear summary of the significant portions of the prospective lease agreement.

The legislation empowers the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to set uniform standards governing the information which must be set forth in the advisory memorandum. The bill also provides that where the owner of an FHA-insured multifamily dwelling applies for a rental increase above the FHA-approved rent schedule, a public hearing must be held and the tenants must receive notice of such hearing and be given an opportunity to participate therein.

This legislation, of course, would apply only to properties constructed and mortgages insured subsequent to the date of this act. However, the bill gives the Secretary authority to establish regulations to make the provisions of this act operative for properties presently covered by FHA mortgages.

To highlight the need for immediate enactment of this bill, I would like to describe a dramatic instance of misrepresentation by a landlord that occurred a year and a half ago. A large middle-income apartment complex in my congressional district, insured by the FHA, was completed in the fall of 1964, during a period when there was an abundance of vacant dwelling units. The FHA fixed maximum ceilings for the various apartments after the usual consultation and consideration of costs and operating expenses. In order to compete with other available housing and to obtain quick occupancy of the project, the landlord engaged in an operation which in the used-car industry is known as "low-balling." He advertised the apartments at less than the FHA-approved rental schedule. Prospective tenants were impressed with the reasonable rates. Although they thought they were receiving a "good deal," in the long run the tenants suffered. Prior to signing the lease, they were led to believe that the rents offered were the FHA-approved rentals; therefore, they felt justified in relying on a continuance of these rents after the expiration of their leases. Of course, they

understood that there was a possibility for an upward adjustment of their rents at the termination of these leases, but one that would be modest. Having no reason to expect soaring rents, the tenants made extensive investments by furnishing and decorating their apartments, became involved in community life, and enrolled their children in local schools. But when the leases expired, they received the hammer blow. The landlord, as a condition for renewal of the leases, advised tenants that rents would be increased from 31 to 45 percent. He did this notwithstanding the fact that he had told the FHA, in writing, that the increase would be from 10 to 15 percent.

During this period, the landlord, having received less income than anticipated by the FHA schedule, received approval from the FHA for a deferment of payment of principal on the mortgage of these dwellings. Ironically, the FHA, rather than the landlord, was underwriting the initial rent advantage gained by the tenants.

The consequence of this situation, in a nutshell, is this: The tenants, while gaining a momentary advantage on their rents, were faced with totally unexpected 31- to 45-percent rent increases, and many of them found themselves unable to carry this additional financial burden. They were caught between the devil and the deep blue sea—either they had to continue to pay a rent they could not afford or leave the premises, suffering all the attendant expenses and discomforts that such removal causes.

Since that time, the landlord of this apartment complex made the meager concession of offering the tenants time to look for other accommodations. A 1-year lease was offered to those who wanted it. For those who opted to stay, he prorated the increase over 3 years—and by the third year, his 40-percent increase was complete.

The victims of events such as the one I just related are not a group of transients. For the most part, they are people who intend to remain in their new apartments for many years and are people who would provide stability to their community. If they are uprooted from their homes, we are all affected. Should landlords of FHA-insured housing be permitted to mislead tenants into thinking they have a good deal by offering rents far below the FHA ceiling—rents that suddenly soar after the lease expires—we will witness an increase in the flow of middle-income groups from urban areas. If this flight is stepped up, the city will become the home of only the very rich and the very poor.

The problem I have related here is as serious today as it was a year and a half ago. And it is not an isolated local problem. It is neither unique to this 750-family development nor to my congressional district. Within the city of New York there are 93,000 rental units and some 554,000 within the United States that would be covered by the provisions of this Truth-in-Renting Act.

In short, not only the tenant's interest, but the national interest as well, requires a new impetus to provide information to the prospective tenant, infor-

mation that will enable him to clarify his needs and his priorities when seeking housing.

This bill proposes to cure the inability of the prospective tenant to fully comprehend the terms of the agreement that will bind him under his lease. It requires the owner to supply him with adequate information concerning his prospective tenancy and the contents of the proposed lease. This will enable the tenant to make an intelligent determination as to whether or not the terms and conditions by which he will be bound under the lease are those which he is prepared to accept.

Under current renting procedures for the type of housing covered by this bill, a prospective tenant is usually shown either a model apartment or plans. He is also advised of the rent and frequently told by a renting agent of the terms and conditions of the proposed rental agreement. Upon oral acceptance of the deal the tenant will sign a rental application and offer a deposit. The rental application will frequently bind the tenant to execute a lease, or, failing that, forfeit the deposit. In practice, tenants cursorily examine the rental application and pay even less attention to a long, involved, small-print hard-to-understand lease.

Needless to say, it would require a book the length of "Gone With the Wind" to report in detail the many representations that renting agents have made to prospective tenants to solicit their tenancy. A zealous renting agent, anxious for a commission, frequently makes exaggerated promises and conscious misrepresentations.

Often such leases have automatic rent-escalation clauses and numerous other clauses that could be detrimental to the prospective tenant. This bill requires that a simple summary of the terms and conditions of the lease be affixed to the rental application. The tenant will then have the opportunity to read the summary prior to the execution of the rental application and the tendering of a deposit. Thus, his subsequent decision as to whether or not to enter into a contract with the owner will be based on a critical evaluation of pertinent facts, and their relationship to his needs.

The bill would also provide additional insurance for tenants against unfair and unjustified rent increases by permitting them to be parties to any proceedings by which the FHA approves a rent increase. No increase in the rent above the ceilings set in the rent schedule can be approved by the FHA without a public hearing. This hearing must be held in the community where the property is located, affording an opportunity for all tenants to present their views before the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development or the FHA Commissioner makes a determination.

This proposal is consistent with the proposition President Kennedy set forth in 1962 that consumers not only have the right to be informed, but, equally important, are entitled to be heard in decisions affecting their interest. It is my view that as long as a Government agency, in this instance the FHA, is to make decisions affecting the rights of tenants, then the tenants have an abso-

lute right to participate in the decision-making process.

It is true that rent increases may be justified following increases in municipal and local taxes or increases in the cost of operating the property. Surely no one can complain if such bills, documents, and tax assessments are presented in public hearings. In my judgment, this procedure will promote a favorable landlord-tenant relationship by dispelling suspicions that arise from one-sided participation.

This Truth-in-Renting Act does not in any way handicap the normal opportunities for a landlord and tenant to enter into a contract of lease. Nor is it a step toward national rent control. It does not create hardships on landlords; it poses only simple obligations that can easily be met; will in no way impair the economic viability of their investments. As long as a builder, developer, or landlord seeks the assistance of the Federal Government by way of insurance of a mortgage, we must insist that he and the agency insuring the mortgage provide the tenants with adequate information to balance the scales of the economic relationship.

In summary, I would urge my colleagues to extend to the housing field a praiseworthy trend that has taken place in other areas of consumer concern. "Let the buyer beware" has been rejected as the slogan of the marketplace. It is our responsibility to carry forward the converse of that theme: "Let the buyer know." The enactment of the Freedom of Information Act, which requires agencies of the Federal Government to make available information and records within their possession is evidence of our recognition of the public's right to be informed.

I seek nothing more than to permit a prospective consumer-tenant to make an intelligent decision based on sufficient and adequate information. We must keep in mind that informed choice by a consumer and a prospective tenant lies at the heart of a free and competitive economy.

OTTO OTEPKA: COUNTRY ABOVE POLITICS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the intrigue surrounding Otto Otepka continues to be stranger than fiction.

Why must Otto Otepka continue to suffer for placing his country above partisan politics?

His last remaining appeal is to the American people—by telling them the full story. Otto Otepka has kept faith with his fellow countrymen. Let us hope the American people will not abandon this dedicated civil servant.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 6787 which would protect Federal employees from dismissal or discipline for testifying before a congressional committee. This is the same bill introduced by the then Senator Richard Nixon—

S. 1390—in the first session of the 82d Congress.

I include news clippings on the tragic betrayal of Otto Otepka, the text of H.R. 6787, and Senator Nixon's remarks upon introducing S. 1390, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 2, 1969]

OTEPKA FINDS WHY JOB DENIED

(By William Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—On Jan. 21, the day after President Nixon's inauguration, Secretary of State William P. Rogers had already made up his mind that he did not want Otto F. Otepka in the state department.

If Otepka would resign his post, Rogers informed Otepka's attorney on that date, he would help him get a job in private industry. His retention would create too many problems with holdover officials, Rogers contended.

REFUSES TO QUIT

When Otepka refused to surrender in his five-year battle for vindication, Rogers notified him on Feb. 21 that his appeal for reinstatement had been rejected.

These and other heretofore hidden details of his post-inaugural negotiations with the Nixon administration have been revealed by Otepka. He also included them in a record memorandum for his lawyer, Roger Robb, in which he announced his intention to appeal for justice to the federal courts.

Otepka faced another blow in pursuing this appeal, it was learned. Robb, the attorney most familiar with the celebrated case, is under consideration for appointment by Nixon to a federal court of appeals vacancy. If he goes on the bench, he will have to withdraw from the case.

If new counsel becomes necessary, James M. Stewart, head of the American Defense fund, Palatine, Ill., which has already raised \$27,000 for Otepka's legal expenses, said the necessary arrangements will be made. He has been deluged with offers of aid since Rogers appeared to end all hopes for Otepka's reinstatement.

OTEPKA IS UNPERTURBED

Unperturbed by a series of setbacks which would have reduced a lesser man to despair, Otepka disclosed the latest chapter in what has been termed by the Senate internal security subcommittee, "The Otepka Tragedy."

It began more than 8 years ago, in December, 1960, when Otepka was asked by Robert F. Kennedy, attorney general-designate, to waive security investigations for a number of state department appointees. He refused.

Otepka was then at the peak of his career as chief of security in the state department. He had received commendations from the Eisenhower administration for outstanding achievements.

A three-year ordeal followed during which he was demoted, put under surveillance, subjected to phone tapping, and finally, in November, 1963, fired for conduct unbecoming a state department officer.

REINSTATED IN 1967

A Senate inquiry branded his treatment "extraordinary and calculated harassment of a loyal and patriotic officer for conscientious performance of his duties." In December, 1967, after four years of hearings, Secretary of State Dean Rusk was forced to cancel the discharge but ordered a severe reprimand, a \$6,000 cut in salary, and stripped him of security assignments.

Otepka went on a leave-without-pay basis, refusing to accept clerical duties assigned him. He looked forward to reconsideration of his case under a new administration.

He was fortified in this faith by a number of developments. In February, 1966, Nixon had personally told him he was acquainted with the facts in his case and advised: "Stay in there and fight."

NIXON VOWS ACTION

In October, 1968, Nixon pledged in an interview to "order a full and exhaustive review of all the evidence in this case with a view to seeing that justice is accorded this man who has served his country so long and so well."

Later that month, at a campaign stop in Mt. Prospect, Ill., Nixon was asked by Stewart, the defense fund raiser, about the Otepka case and responded: "I know all about that situation. I will help Otto Otepka after I get into office."

"You can imagine my dismay," said Otepka, "when I was told on Jan. 21 by my attorney, Mr. Robb, that he had been in touch with secretary Rogers and been told that he did not want me back in the office of security."

WORST NEWS WITHHELD

Robb, he later learned, had held back an even more crushing statement by the new secretary. He did not want Otepka back in the state department in any capacity but "offered to assist [Otepka] in locating a position in private industry."

Unaware that he had already lost his case and asked to outline what terms he would accept for a "settlement," Otepka prepared a memorandum which he submitted to Robb on Jan. 24.

In this paper, he acknowledged that his reinstatement as chief of evaluations, office of security, would pose problems because of the retention of Idar Rimestad as deputy under secretary for administration.

Rimestad would be his superior and Rimestad was linked with the long history of harassment outlined by the Senate inquiry.

HE OFFERS CONCESSIONS

Under these circumstances, Otepka said, he would accept a written declaration of the actions taken against him by Secretary Rusk as "not consistent with the evidence" and restoration to his former position. He would then "immediately avail myself of any appropriate procedures to retire from the government service."

This accommodation was apparently not acceptable to Rogers. It would constitute repudiation of Rusk's actions and confirm the Senate's verdict of "calculated harassment."

On Feb. 22, Robb gave Otepka the bad news—Rogers had never wanted him back in the state department because "his presence would result in objections from some officers and he desired to avoid this problem."

"With no disrespect for Secretary Rogers," Otepka said, "I find his statements that he does not want me in any department job highly prejudicial, grossly unfair and completely uncalled for. It is in violation of civil service law."

"It was President Nixon, not Mr. Rogers, who promised a review of this case and that justice would be done. He also vowed during the campaign that, under his administration, all government employees would be guaranteed fair and impartial treatment by their employers, including the right to confront and cross-examine accusers."

CLAIMS RIGHTS DENIED

"This right was denied me by Secretary Rusk. As a consequence, no evidence went into the Civil Service commission hearings concerning the falsehoods surrounding the tapping of my telephone and the planting of materials in my trash bags, measures approved by high officials as part of a scheme to destroy my career as a security officer."

"Mr. Rogers now says he has reviewed the 'documentation' in my case. He did not mention in his letter whether he made this judgment with the advice and consent of the President."

Commenting upon Rogers' suggestion that Otepka might be granted administrative

leave with pay while he pursued his court appeal, Otepka said:

"I want Mr. Rogers to understand that I do not need the government's charity. I desire only simple justice that will right a wrong committed against me and punish the real offenders.

"Instead of observing the impartiality required of a supervisor, Mr. Rogers appears to be behaving like Mr. Rusk and those he inherited from Mr. Rusk who had joined in seeking to oust me by any means, fair or foul.

"I cannot accept Mr. Rogers' offers of assistance. It would be a mistake for me to draw a government salary while appealing to the courts. The department could prevent my public appearances and statements to explain my case to the American people. I am sure the public wants to know why Mr. Rogers is trying to eradicate me and who it is that he is appealing in the process."

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 25, 1969]

INTRIGUE IN OTEPKA CASE: ROBB TO BE MADE JUDGE

(By Edith K. Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—Otto F. Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, is being made a federal judge in the latest intrigue to prevent Otto F. Otepka, conscientious security chief, from returning to The State Department where he would be in a position to impede or destroy Red infiltration.

The White House will make the announcement after President Nixon's return from Europe. Robb will then resign as Otepka's attorney and no member of the Robb firm will accept Otepka's case and he will be without an attorney.

Robb only informed his client on Saturday, Feb. 22 of the offer of the Judgeship which he said he intends to accept. However, unbeknown to Otepka, Robb was offered the post in late December last year. This was part of a package deal between President Nixon, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, U.S. Attorney General John N. Mitchell.

The Government Employees Exchange, a newspaper for federal employees published in Washington, D.C., wrote in its Feb. 5 issue that the State Department "has received repeated indications that Mr. Otepka's attorney, Roger Robb, was 'weary of the case' because of the time he had to devote to the Otepka case. The department knows positively that Mr. Robb is personally 'most loathe' to go into a long and time-consuming court fight, the source revealed."

Robb wrote Sidney Goldberg, publisher of the Government Employees Exchange, in a letter dated Feb. 7 denying that his "enthusiasm" for the Otepka case had anything to do with the size of the fee and the ability to pay of this client. (Robb has already received at least \$28,000 from Otepka in this case which has been stalled from resolution).

Robb told Goldberg:

"The amount of my compensation has nothing to do with my devotion to Mr. Otepka's cause. In fact, if the need arose I would offer to represent him without compensation."

Otepka estimates that the cost of taking his case through the courts would amount to about \$110,000. He has been on leave of absence without pay from the State Department. His movements have been under surveillance by scores of private detectives, FBI agents, CIA operatives and informers as well as a surprising large number of friends in whom he confides. From their reports, a State Department source said that agency officials now believe that Otepka is both financially and emotionally exhausted, and is ready to give up the fight. The difficulty of finding a competent, courageous lawyer free of political ties, will be Otepka's next hurdle if he wishes to continue his fight for vindication and the restoration of his old job.

Thus far, Otepka's legal expenses have

been paid by the American Defense Fund, headed by James M. Stewart of Palatine, Ill. Thousands of individual citizens have contributed.

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Feb. 19, 1969]

POWER STRUGGLE LOOMS OVER BEAM, OTEPKA, SONNENFELD BETWEEN CONGRESS, STATE

A "violent storm" is brewing between the Nixon administration and Capitol Hill over the failure of the President and his Department heads to extend normal consultation courtesies to Senators and Congressmen, this newspaper was informed on February 15. Although the "storm" already encompasses more than one Department, it is becoming sharpest between the State Department and Capitol Hill over the issue of "excessive privilege" as defined by Secretary of State William P. Rogers, the informant said.

The first lightning flashes have already been seen privately in the tone of the letters between Capitol Hill and the White House concerning Ambassador Jacob Dyneley Beam, whom Secretary Rogers is supporting for the position of the next U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, the source claimed.

The first reaction from the White House to the letters was "pained surprise" that the personnel dossier on Ambassador Beam sent to the President by the State Department did not contain such material on him as that which *The Exchange* had published more than a year ago, the informant stated.

JACOB BEAM

As readers of this newspaper will recall, Jacob Dyneley Beam was the American Ambassador at Warsaw during the outbreak of the notorious "sex and spy" scandals there in 1959-1961. Included in these scandals were Foreign Service Officer Erwin Scarbeck who delivered secret documents to the Polish authorities after he was surprised and photographed naked in bed with his mistress, Urszula Discher. Mr. Scarbeck was subsequently convicted by a Federal court in Washington, D.C. and was sentenced to prison. Ambassador Beam testified during his trial.

Another Foreign Service Officer, Thomas A. Donovan, was also named during the hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as having had sexual relations with Polish female intelligence agents. This newspaper reported that, although the State Department wished to re-assign Mr. Donovan immediately to Washington after his "liaison" was discovered, Ambassador Beam arranged with his former Princeton College "old school tie" classmates, Ambassador E. Allen Lightner Jr. and Foreign Service Officer Howard Trivers, to have Mr. Donovan transferred instead to Berlin, Germany, where Ambassador Lightner was chief of mission and Mr. Trivers was his Deputy Chief.

In Berlin, Mr. Donovan was placed in charge of the Eastern Affairs Division, which had supervision over all reporting concerning East Berlin and East Germany. In this role, Mr. Donovan received official documents recording telephonic intercepts by American intelligence officers of telephone conversations made between West Berlin and East Berlin and East Germany.

THOMAS A. DONOVAN

Because of his knowledge that these telephone intercepts were being made, Mr. Donovan went to Communist East Berlin to evade the telephonic monitoring of his own unauthorized telephone calls to Polish friends in Warsaw. These included his "girl friend" and such Polish officials as Jerry Michalowski, then the Director General of the Polish Foreign Ministry and today the Polish Ambassador in Washington, D.C.

During one of these telephone conversations, Mr. Donovan requested Ambassador Michalowski to instruct the Polish Military Mission in West Berlin to issue a visitor's visa to Mr. Donovan without the prior knowledge

of American diplomatic officers in Warsaw so that Mr. Donovan could proceed there without their previous authorization. The Polish Military Mission honored the instruction of the Polish Foreign Ministry and issued Mr. Donovan the visa he desired.

When Foreign Service Officer Stephen A. Koczak reported these telephone calls to Foreign Service Officer Howard Trivers and to Ambassador E. Allen Lightner Jr., they accused him of trying to "stab Donovan in the back" and did not convoke any board of inquiry to ascertain the truthfulness of Mr. Koczak's allegations. Instead, they informed Mr. Donovan of Mr. Koczak's reports to them about him. Subsequently, Messrs. Donovan, Trivers, and Lightner destroyed the original pages of the efficiency report they had written in 1961 on Mr. Koczak, forged substitute pages, backdated these and inserted them into his efficiency report as if they had in fact been the original pages. In addition, Ambassador Lightner wrote an "Additional Reviewing Statement" to the effect that Mr. Koczak had read the entire report and had, in the course of interrogation, admitted to "tale bearing" and one instance of "intrigue" against Mr. Donovan. Mr. Koczak has repeatedly denied having made any such admission; he also denies ever having read the altered efficiency report prior to its dispatch to the State Department.

Despite Mr. Koczak's denials, he was fired by the State Department under the procedure of "selection out," a process which denies any formal appeals procedure to officers and does not permit confrontation and cross-examination.

Mr. Koczak's attorney, Marion Harrison, has repeatedly asked the State Department for admission or denial of these facts and, to date, the State Department has refused to comment on them.

SOVIETS BREAK CODES

Another "disturbing item" in the letters of the Senators to President Nixon concerning Ambassador Beam, the source continued, was the charge that the Soviet Union broke the "top secret and secret" codes of the United States by implanting "listening devices" into the bricks ordered from Yugoslavia for the new American Embassy building built in Warsaw during the incumbency there of Ambassador Beam.

ELMER DEWEY HILL

After the Embassy's walls were erected, an "electronic survey" was conducted by State Department security electronics technician, Elmer Dewey Hill, to detect and eliminate any "bugging" devices. Mr. Hill found none. Thus the Soviet and Polish intelligence agencies successfully recorded the reading of the texts of American top secret and secret codes by the code clerks while doing the encoding and decoding. Subsequently, by comparing these with the transmitted messages, the Soviet Union broke the codes. This resulted in the breaking also of the major codes of the United States in messages being sent to Germany, Italy, France, England and Japan. Central Intelligence Agency telegrams and communications were "broken" in the same manner by the Soviet Union, the source revealed.

OTTO F. OTEPKA

Elmer Dewey Hill was subsequently instructed by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, John Reilly, to "bug", with the assistance of Clarence Jerome Schneider, the telephone and office room of Otto F. Otepka, the State Department's top security evaluator, the source continued. Mr. Hill later denied under oath that he had had this role but when George Pasquale, a friend of Mr. Otepka, obtained an admission from one of the participants, Mr. Hill recanted and admitted he had lied under oath. Subsequently, Mr. Reilly also recanted and both he and Mr. Hill resigned from the State Department.

A lawyer and protege of the late Senator

Robert F. Kennedy, Mr. Reilly subsequently was given a job as a "hearing officer" with the Federal Communications Commission at the same salary he had before.

Mr. Otepka, on the other hand, was demoted and reprimanded by Secretary of State Dean Rusk for having told the truth "without authorization", to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

WILLIAM P. ROGERS

The informant revealed further that Secretary Rogers was very upset about the attempt of the three Senators to influence President Nixon through correspondence to change his mind about appointing Ambassador Beam to Moscow. Secretary Rogers is known to have been personally very critical of the role Mr. Otepka played in cooperating with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and for "telling the truth" without authorization. According to the source, Secretary Rogers is of the firm opinion that Mr. Otepka should have refused to answer the questions posed to him by Julian Sourwine, the Subcommittee's chief counsel, on the grounds of "executive privilege", a doctrine which Mr. Rogers espoused and expanded during the Eisenhower administration when he was Attorney General.

As this newspaper reported in its February 5 issue, Secretary Rogers has already vetoed President Nixon's election promise to re-examine the Otto F. Otepka case. On January 21, he informed Mr. Otepka, through intermediaries, that he would not allow Mr. Otepka back as an "active security officer". He also asked Mr. Otepka to indicate to him any other "alternative remedy" on the understanding Mr. Otepka would not remain in security work. Mr. Otepka's terms were communicated to Secretary Rogers through intermediaries, in the form of a memorandum, January 24, ostensibly addressed to Mr. Otepka's lawyer, Roger Robb.

The source revealed that Mr. Rogers chose this course of action in regard to Mr. Otepka because he is aware that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee is planning new hearings on State Department security. The reinstatement of Mr. Otepka to security work would be hailed by the public and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as an admission by the State Department that "executive privilege" could not be invoked by it in forbidding its employees to "tell the truth" during testimony before Congressional Committees. Thus Secretary Rogers could not refuse "authorization" in the future to any State Department employee to testify truthfully and fully under oath on State Department practices.

Regarding Mr. Otepka, Mr. Rogers was reported saying he feared especially that, if re-instated and again ordered to testify under oath, Mr. Otepka would again proceed to tell the Subcommittee the "truth" about the current state of the State Department's security clearance program, including such matters as the disappearance of classified information from the security files of Ambassador Jacob Beam and of Helmut Sonnenfeldt, until January 20 an employee of the Department of State. Mr. Sonnenfeldt, about whom controversy is raging secretly within the intelligence and security communities, was recently appointed by Dr. Henry Kissinger to join him on the staff of the National Security Council located in offices next to the White House.

EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

As defined and expanded by Secretary Rogers when he was Attorney General, "executive privilege" is the doctrine that the executive branch of the government has the "right to refuse" to give Congress any document that includes either an advice, a recommendation or a conclusion. These documents therefore include all personnel actions involving the selection, promotion, demotion,

transfer, dismissal or reprimand of any federal employee, if such action involves advice, recommendation or a conclusion from or by any federal officer.

Although he admitted as Attorney General that the Constitution did not explicitly give the executive departments such "power to refuse", Secretary Rogers nevertheless contended the executive branch had "an inherent right" to refuse to give testimony or produce records. In fact, he went much further and insisted that Congress could not even pass a law to require or force the executive department to produce such records, and that any such laws already on the books were not binding on the executive branch. In short, under this interpretation by Attorney General Rogers, Congress was impotent versus the "executive privilege", even if it was being invoked to "protect" or to "cover up" or to "white wash" executive actions.

In addition, Secretary Rogers claimed that the so-called independent regulatory agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, also had the "right" to invoke "executive privilege."

On the basis of this extreme definition of "executive privilege", no Federal employee would have the "right" to "tell the truth" or produce records on any substantive subject unless he had the prior approval or "authorization" from his superiors, the source commented.

CONGRESSIONAL RIGHTS

The doctrine of "executive privilege", as espoused by Mr. Rogers when he was Attorney General and as he is now re-asserting it to President Nixon in the cases of Ambassador Beam, Otto Otepka and Helmut Sonnenfeldt, is expected to lead to a "Constitutional storm and crisis" in the next six months, the source said, "unless President Nixon backs away from this exaggerated claim of executive privilege". Either Secretary Rogers will have to change his point of view radically or the battle between the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government will become "irrepressible", the source concluded.

H.R. 6787

A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1505 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "(a)" before "Whoever" at the beginning thereof and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whoever as an officer of the United States or of any department or agency thereof causes or attempts to cause a witness, who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, to be demoted, dismissed, retired, or otherwise disciplined on account of his attending or having attended any inquiry or investigation being had by either House, or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the Congress, or on account of his testifying or having testified to any matter pending therein, or on account of his testimony on any matter pending therein, unless such testimony discloses misfeasance, malfeasance, dereliction of duty, or past reprehensible conduct on the part of such witness, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"The demotion, dismissal, or retirement (other than voluntary or for physical disability) of such witness within one year after attending or testifying in such inquiry or investigation, unless such testimony dis-

closes misfeasance, malfeasance, dereliction of duty, or past reprehensible conduct on the part of such witness, shall be considered prima facie evidence that such witness was demoted, dismissed, or retired because of such attendance or such testimony."

Sec. 2. Section 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "(a)" before "No" at the beginning thereof and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) No witness, who is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States or an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, shall be demoted, dismissed, retired, or otherwise disciplined on account of testimony given or official papers or records produced by such witness before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee established by a joint or concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, unless such testimony is given or such official papers or records are produced in violation of law, or unless such testimony or the production of such papers or records discloses misfeasance, malfeasance, dereliction of duty, or reprehensible conduct on the part of such witness."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 26, 1951]

PROTECTION OF COMMITTEE WITNESSES FROM DISCHARGE BY SUPERIOR OFFICERS

MR. NIXON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPFEL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from California may proceed, as requested.

The bill (S. 1390) to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MR. NIXON. Mr. President, I have introduced in the Senate today a bill to make it a violation of law for any officer of the Federal Government to dismiss or otherwise discipline a Government employee for testifying before a committee of Congress.

In the next few days congressional committees will open hearings on our far-eastern policy, the conduct of the Korean War, and the dismissal of General MacArthur by the President. It is essential to the security of the Nation and the very lives of the people, as we look into these vitally important issues that every witness have complete freedom from reprisal when he is given an opportunity to tell what he knows.

There is too much at stake to permit foreign policy and military strategy to be established on the basis of half truths and the suppression of testimony.

Unless protection is given to witnesses who are members of the armed services or employees of the Government, the scheduled hearings will amount to no more than a parade of yes men for administration policies as they exist.

The bill I have introduced is designed to assure any member of the Armed Forces or other officer or employee of the Government who can offer pertinent and constructive testimony that he can speak the truth without suffering the fate of Admiral Denfeld on account of such testimony.

LINCOLN, THE READER

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Lincoln group of the District of Columbia, at its annual meeting had the opportunity recently to hear Mr. David J. Harkness present an excellent dissertation entitled, "Lincoln, the Reader."

Mr. Speaker, I have heard and read many fine speeches on the subject of the literary talents of Lincoln and the background of his reading, but none better than this speech given by Mr. Harkness. In addition, there have been many books published on this subject, all of which were very enlightening and give an impressive insight into the character of Lincoln, by way of his association with literature. This is a very fine contribution to the Lincoln literature, and I am inserting it in the RECORD where others may benefit from this magnificent dissertation.

I should add that Mr. Harkness is the director of the department of program planning and library services at the University of Tennessee.

The address follows:

LINCOLN, THE READER

(By David J. Harkness, director of program planning and library services, University of Tennessee, Knoxville)

A famous educator once came to the White House to see President Lincoln in support of a fellow educator who was seeking a government post. "No man," he explained "has plunged deeper into the fountain of learning. Nor come out drier," said Lincoln. Mr. Lincoln once said of a long-winded lawyer: "He can compress the most words into the smallest ideas of any man I ever met," Lincoln, on the other hand, could say more in fewer words than any figure, perhaps, in American history. For instance, he gave us a capsule book review: "For those who like this kind of book, this is the kind of book they will like."

The familiar picture of young Abe Lincoln reading by an open fire reminds us that it is only natural that the man who was noted for his gift of storytelling should have found enjoyment in fictional writing. Three books which tell a story were read and re-read by the youth in Indiana—"Robinson Crusoe," "Pilgrim's Progress," and "Aesop's Fables." Defoes classic held the same fascination for Lincoln that it has had for all boys who love adventure. It is believed that the Second Inaugural Address shows the influence of Bunyan's famous leave-taking of Christian in his great allegory. Lincoln's lifelong interest in telling a story to illustrate a point seems to have sprung from his reading of the fables of the Greek slave. During this same period in Indiana he borrowed a copy of the "Arabian Nights" from a neighbor, David Turnham, and fell under the spell of the Oriental enchantment of Sinbad the Sailor.

Years later Lincoln was to delve into another treasure house of narrative. In 1860 during a stay at a hotel in Bloomington, Illinois, while in attendance at court, it was noticed that he was absorbed in a book while eating his meals. When Julius H. Royce inquired about his absorption, Lincoln replied: "I am reading Homer, the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey.' You should read him. He has a grip and he knows how to tell a story." In 1864 Lincoln drew Chapman's translation of Homer from the Library of Congress in order to renew his zestful pleasure in this classic. This

type of reading no doubt helped mold his style and gave him "the Attic simplicity and Hellenic elevation of his closing and deathless utterances," as Talcott Williams expresses it.

During the New Salem years he read two of Cooper's "Leatherstocking Tales"—"The Pioneers" and "The Last of the Mohicans." Just as the growing lad on Pigeon Creek in Spencer County, Indiana, knew the domestic animals which were a part of every frontier home, and also the wildlife of wood, field, and stream, and was thus better able to appreciate the fables of Aesop, so the man reading a book on the banks of the Sangamon River in Illinois also had firsthand acquaintance with nature in the pioneer environment and was well prepared to re-create the setting of Cooper's novels. Noah Brooks says, "He had seen something of the fast-receding Indian of the American forests, and he had heard, many a time of his father's thrilling escape from the red man's clutches, and of his grandfather's cruel death in the Kentucky clearing; and when he withdrew his fascinated attention from the vivid pages of Cooper's novels, he almost expected to see the painted savages lurking in the outskirts of the forest so near at hand."

As he grew older Abe developed a liking for short stories rather than novels. Rufus Rockwell Wilson says: "Lincoln, an occasional reader of fiction, seems to have preferred the short story to the novel or romance of average length." Howard Haycraft says that William Dean Howells' campaign biography served to establish Lincoln as the first of the countless eminent men who have turned to the detective story for stimulation and solace. Howells made this statement regarding Lincoln as a mystery fan: "The best of his mind is mathematical and metaphysical, and he is therefore pleased with the absolute and logical method of Poe's tales and sketches, in which the problem of mystery is given, and wrought out into everyday facts by processes of cunning analysis. It is said that he suffers no year to pass without the perusal of this author." It is interesting to note that Abraham Lincoln and Edgar Allan Poe were born in the same year and that each suffered a tragically premature death.

Lincoln's law partner, William H. Herndon, was an omnivorous reader and often gave Abe books to read. He bought one of the first copies of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" offered for sale in Springfield and it is altogether probable that Lincoln read it in whole or in part. Henry B. Rankin said, "Mrs. Stowe's 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' moved him deeply while reading it." In 1862 the Lincolns drew from the Library of Congress a copy of Mrs. Stowe's "Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin." When Harriet Beecher Stowe called on the President at the White House that year, Lincoln walked toward her with outstretched hands and greeted her: "So you're the little woman who wrote the book that made this great war."

Herndon says that his partner never read a novel in its entirety. He states that while Lincoln began Scott's "Ivanhoe" he did not finish it, and that he refused to read Bulwer-Lytton and Dickens. But Billy may not have been accurate in this statement. While he may not have read "The Last Days of Pompeii" or "Oliver Twist," Oliver R. Barrett was convinced that Lincoln read Dickens' "Pickwick Papers," basing his belief on the President's familiarity with the character of Sam Weller. Certainly the humor in that book is of a kind that Lincoln would have enjoyed. The Library of Congress records show that the "Pickwick Papers" was taken out on the Lincolns' card in 1864 and that Bulwer-Lytton's "The Caxtons" was charged to the President's family in the same year. Once, when speaking of Charles Dickens, Lincoln said: "His works of fiction are so near reality that the author seems to have picked up his material from actual life as he elbowed his way through its crowded thoroughfares." Maybe he was familiar with "David Copper-

field" to the extent that he understood what Salmon P. Chase meant when he wrote of the President's "Micawber policy of waiting for something to turn up."

Herndon tells us that at New Salem Lincoln read Caroline Lee Hentz's novels of Southern life, but one wonders if he found them very entertaining. M. L. Houser, commenting on a copy of Mrs. Hentz's "Linda or the Young Pilot of the Belle Creole" in his collection of books which Lincoln read, observed that readers of this novel are "expected to weep over an angelic heroine, a weak father, a cruel stepfather, a designing stepbrother and a hero who twice rescues Linda from death at their first two meetings (and still the villain pursued her)." Houser said that some remark which Lincoln made in a speech indicated a close acquaintance with "Don Quixote" by Cervantes. Wilson says that Lincoln read this classic in the White House, that he gratefully recognized a kindred spirit in the wise and gentle Spaniard and gave many an hour to the adventures of his melancholy knight. Thus the man of many moods—jovial, sad, outgoing, brooding—found reflected in fiction the elements of his own temperament. It is no wonder, then, that Lincoln said: "My best friend is the man who will get me a book I have not read." One day he heard of someone in Rockford, Illinois, twenty miles away, who had a book he wanted to read. Abe walked the twenty miles to Rockford and back. There was no lack of physical energy when he wanted something badly enough—like a book he had not read.

Books were scarce in the sparsely settled woodlands of Illinois, but Lincoln once told one of his friends that he guessed he had "read every book he had ever heard of in that country for a circuit of fifty miles." In a letter to John M. Brockman dated September 25, 1860, Lincoln wrote: "Get the books and read, and study them carefully." He had earlier said, "I shall study and work—and maybe my chance will come." He was a good example of adult education, based on intensive reading in a variety of subjects—a true product of the library. O. H. Browning, a fellow lawyer, said: "Lincoln was always a learner, and in that respect the most notable man I have ever seen."

Lincoln's great love was the Bible, which he called "the best gift God has given to men." He read it constantly, and his familiarity with its contents far exceeded that of many clergymen. His speeches are filled with Biblical phrases and thoughts. He once wrote to his Louisville, Ky., friend, Joshua Fry Speed: "I am profitably engaged in reading the Bible. Take all of this book upon reason that you can, and the balance on faith, and you will live and die a better man." He frequently read biographies of the founding fathers, including Ramsey's "Life of Washington," Wirt's "Life of Patrick Henry," Flint's "Life of Daniel Boone," Weems' "Life of Washington" and "Life of Francis Marion," and Franklin's "Autobiography."

In his lifetime poetry had a wide audience and books by popular poets became best-sellers. But Lincoln turned to poetry much more than did the average man and his knowledge of it was marked not only by good taste but by familiarity. With him, to like a poem was to memorize it, to recite it, use it, and quote it on repeated occasions. His powers of memory were extraordinary and his ability to recite poetry with telling effect was confirmed by many who heard him. The thoughts and philosophies of the poets were reflected in the President's life and spirit, inspiring and comforting him. Mrs. Lincoln once said to Billy Herndon: "I never saw a man's mind develop itself so finely. Mr. Lincoln had a kind of poetry in his nature." Rankin believed that Mrs. Lincoln's appreciation of the best in literature, and the books they read together in the home, were forceful stimulants to Lincoln's intellectual life.

Lincoln once said, "The things I want to know are to be found in the pages of a book."

Anything that looked like a book was "grist for his mill." From books he could learn the answers to questions which puzzled him or could absorb fine literature written by brilliant men for the entertainment and enlightenment of mankind. In a speech before the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society in Milwaukee on September 30, 1859, he said: "A capacity and taste for reading gives access to whatever has already been discovered by others. It is the key, or one of the keys, to the already solved problems. And not only so. It gives a relish and facility for successfully pursuing the unsolved ones." It is known that Lincoln spent much time in the Library of Congress when he was in Washington, so much so that a fellow Congressman said, "Bah! He is a book-worm!"

Contemporaries of Lincoln in Illinois stated that he usually kept a copy of Shakespeare's plays in his pocket when he was traveling over the circuit and that he read them during spare moments. He could quote long passages from the Bard of Avon. His secretary, John Hay, said that Lincoln read Shakespeare more than all other writers together and that he went occasionally to the theater. He said Lincoln's favorite plays were "Hamlet," "Macbeth," and the histories, especially "Richard II." He spoke of a time when the President read passages from "Henry V" and "Richard III" to him. He would read Shakespeare for hours "with a single secretary for audience," Hay said. Lincoln seems to have had Shakespearean quotations on his tongue on many occasions. He once said to a delegation which invited him to a Shakespearean celebration by a literary society: "For am I not a fellow of infinite jest?" In all probability Lincoln had a deeper appreciation of Shakespeare than any other statesman of his time. William Dean Howells in his campaign biography wrote: "He is also a diligent student of Shakespeare, to know whom is a liberal education."

Next to Shakespeare, Lincoln liked Robert Burns best. The Railsplitter and the Plowman were much alike, with similar backgrounds of the frontier youth of Illinois and the peasant poet of Scotland. Milton Hay said Lincoln could quote Burns by the hour and James H. Matheny, who served as best man in his wedding, said Abe learned a number of Burns' poems by heart and often recited them. "He found in Burns a like thinker and feeler," he said. Lincoln delivered a lecture on Burns in Springfield on January 25, 1859, at a banquet in Concert Hall celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the Scottish poet's birth. When he was President he was guest at the annual banquet of the Burns Club in Washington, and when he was asked for a toast to be presented on his behalf he wrote these words: "I cannot frame a toast to Burns. I can say nothing worthy of his generous heart and transcending genius. Thinking of what he has said, I cannot say anything which seems worth saying. A. Lincoln." He especially liked "A Man's a Man for A' That," the poem which is said to have inspired the writing of the Emancipation Proclamation. Lincoln once said, "The better part of one's life consists of his friendships," and certainly Burns' "Auld Lang Syne" was a favorite all his life.

Lincoln's favorite poem was written by a young Scottish poet, William Knox, who died in 1825. In 1831 while living in New Salem Lincoln first saw "Mortality or O Why Should the Spirit of Mortal Be Proud?" in a newspaper. In 1846 he sent a copy to a friend and later wrote: "Beyond all question I am not the author. I would give all I am worth and go in debt to be able to write so fine a poem as I think that is. Neither do I know who is the author." But when he was President he learned the identity of the poet from Gen. James Grant Wilson, a distinguished literary critic of Chicago and himself a Scotsman, who gave him a collection of Knox's poems which contained his favorite. Lincoln ended

his eulogy on Zachary Taylor with extracts from this poem. Lincoln showed his liking of Thomas Gray's "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard" when he said that "the short and simple annals of the poor" summed up his own life. Noah Brooks said that Lincoln liked "all songs which had for their theme the rapid flight of time, decay, and the recollection of early days."

Lincoln's third favorite was Byron. Both were lovers of liberty, for the President dreamed that the slaves might be "forever free" and the poet "dreamed that Greece might still be free." There are evidences of his reading and reciting Byron all through his life. In his brooding melancholy Lincoln was definitely a Byronic type, so naturally he found in the Romantic poet a kindred spirit. He believed in dreams as the fore-runners of destiny and could stay with Byron, "I had a dream which was not all of a dream." He liked "Darkness" and "The Dream" and the lines in "Don Juan"—"And if I laugh at any mortal thing 'Tis that I may not weep." Once in a Cabinet meeting when he was chided for his seeming levity in the midst of serious affairs of state, Lincoln remarked that he had to tell a joke now and then to keep from weeping. Another time, after reading a joke to his Cabinet, he said: "Gentlemen, why don't you laugh? With the fearful strain that is upon me night and day, if I did not laugh I should die."

Lincoln liked Longfellow. Both were born in February, both were American to the core, both revered their nation's heritage of freedom and conveyed that ideal to all who read or heard them. Longfellow is the only poet whose writings are known to have moved Lincoln to tears. When his secretary, John Nicolay, read "The Building of the Ship" with the lines "Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State, Sail on, O Union, strong and great," aloud to Lincoln, he could tell that the poem affected him profoundly. When he reached the last lines he said he noticed the President's eyes filled with tears and his cheeks wet. Lincoln did not speak for some minutes, but finally said, with simplicity: "It is a wonderful gift to be able to stir men like that." He referred to the Longfellow poem in a speech at Cleveland on February 15, 1861, when he said: "If we do not make common cause to save the good old Ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another."

Oliver Wendell Holmes, the American poet noted for his geniality, humor, and sincere friendliness, was born the same year as Lincoln. The President knew "The Last Leaf" by heart and often repeated a stanza with deep feeling:

"The mossy marbles rest
On the lips that he has pressed in their bloom;
And the names he loved to hear
Have been carved for many a year on the tomb."

Lincoln said: "For pure pathos, in my judgment, there is nothing finer than those six lines in the English language." Holmes heard of his admiration of this poem and was greatly pleased. Lincoln also committed to memory the last stanza of "The Chambered Nautilus" beginning "Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul."

Just as he liked Holmes' "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table" with the delightful poem "The Deacon's Masterpiece, or the Wonderful One-Hoss Shay," he enjoyed the Yankee dialect and homey philosophy of "The Bigelow Papers" by James Russell Lowell. In his famous ode to Lincoln, Lowell summed up the greatness of the man in a grand and fitting epitaph:

"The kindly-earnest, brave, foreseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil, the first
American."

John Hay wrote of Lincoln: "He read Bryant and Whittier with appreciation." It was William Cullen Bryant who introduced the Illinois frontiersman to the sophisticated New York audience at Cooper Union in 1860. There was a story which went the rounds to the effect that Lincoln said of meeting Bryant: "It was worth the journey to the East to see such a man." Lincoln's faith was reflected in Bryant's poem "To a Waterfowl," for he believed that "there is a Power" which "in the long way that I must tread alone will lead my steps aright." Bryant wrote an elegy titled "The Death of Lincoln," which closes with an appropriate summary of the Great Emancipator:

"Pure was thy life, its bloody close
Hath placed thee with the sons of light,
Among the noble host of those
Who perished in the cause of right."

The poems of John Greenleaf Whittier appealed to one who loved rural life and country people. His own youth in Kentucky and Indiana would be recalled to Lincoln as he read "The Barefoot Boy" and the poignant sadness of "Maud Muller" would no doubt strike a responsive chord. Whittier recorded pastoral beauty and faithfully reproduced the daily life of his boyhood home in "Snow-Bound," just as Abe Lincoln once wrote a poem beginning "My childhood's home I see again." Both loved "the common unrhymed poetry of simple life and country ways," as the New England poet wrote in his winter idyl. Lincoln relied on the strength of God to carry him through difficult decisions, "Doing God's will as if it were my own, Yet trusting not in mine, but in His strength alone," as Whittier expressed it in the poem "First-Day Thoughts."

Lincoln read an early copy of Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass," for a copy was placed on the law office table in Springfield in 1857 by Herndon. He commended the new poet's verses for their virility, freshness, unconventional sentiments, and unique forms of expression. Rankin said Lincoln frequently picked up the volume and read from it and that he predicted Whitman's poems would be given high rank in the future. Once when he saw the poet pass the White House he said, "Well, he looks like a man," and Whitman once said: "Lincoln is my man, particularly belongs to me." This spiritual kinship resulted in the two greatest elegies on the death of Lincoln, "O Captain, My Captain" and "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloom'd" the latter "for the sweetest, wisest soul of all my days and lands, and this for his dear sake."

On board a steamer for a visit with the Army of the Potomac, Lincoln read aloud to Secretary of War Stanton and Captain John A. Dahlgren of the Navy from a volume of Fitz-Green Halleck's verses the poem "Marco Bozzaris," which closes with these lines:

"For thou art Freedom's now, and Fame's,
One of the few, the immortal names,
That were not born to die."

Without realizing it, Lincoln was reading a eulogy which might well apply to himself—and reading it to the man who was to say of him, "Now he belongs to the ages."

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT: EXPLODING SOME MYTHS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this Nation and this Congress are now engaged in

serious discussion of reform of the method of electing our President.

The House Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments are now holding hearings on this subject.

In the course of these hearings, witnesses have exploded the strengths and weaknesses of the various proposals.

I personally favor direct popular election of the President. I feel that when the advantages are clearly understood, this plan will prevail in the Congress and will win ratification by the necessary three-fourths of the States.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion polls have indicated that 80 percent of the American people favor direct popular election of the President.

Even so, some Members of Congress fear that such a plan will not win ratification by the necessary number of States. This fear is based on the belief that small States enjoy a special advantage under the present electoral system that would be lost if every man's vote counted equally.

That the supposed advantage is illusion, not fact, was pointed out today in an editorial in the Washington Post.

Title "Case for the Direct-Election Amendment," the editorial points out that the big States—not the small ones—actually have the advantage under the present system. The comparative vote power of individual citizens in different States is unbalanced by "unnatural influences" which would largely be eliminated under the direct election system simply because "one man's vote would count for as much as any others."

The Post editorial also deals with another myth: that direct popular election will result in the proliferation of minor parties. On the contrary, direct popular election will strengthen the two-party system, as the editorial points out, "by removing special incentives to third parties and equalizing all voters throughout the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Washington Post editorial "Case for the Direct-Election Amendment," in the RECORD, along with a column by Tom Wicker, of the New York Times, which also deals with the effect of direct election upon the vote power of small State voters:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 3, 1969]

CASE FOR THE DIRECT-ELECTION AMENDMENT

A strong case for electoral college reform is being built up in the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. The testimony taken thus far seems to constitute a mandate for change. While there is still much controversy over the nature of the constitutional amendment to be submitted to the states, the rising popularity of direct, popular election of the President and Vice President is impressive.

In a recent session before the House Judiciary Committee, William T. Gossett, president of the American Bar Association, seemed to us to demolish the chief arguments that have been made against a direct, popular election. The first of these arguments is that the smaller states, having an advantage in the present distribution of electoral votes (one for every Senator and Representative) will never give it up. Alaska, for

example, has one presidential elector for each 75,389 persons; California, only one elector for each 392,930 inhabitants. Despite the unfairness of this favoritism for small states, it is said, those states will insist on clinging to their advantage.

But this, as Mr. Gossett has shown, is only one side of the coin. The general ticket system, which throws all the electoral votes of a state to the candidate who wins the popular vote in that state, greatly increases the power of the big states to determine the outcome. Some authorities insist that the individual citizen's chance to vote for 40 electors in California and only three in Alaska gives the big-state voter a greater impact on the outcome. John Banzhaf's analysis of voter power, with the aid of computers, indicates that a voter in the largest states has more than two and a half times as much chance to affect the outcome of a presidential election as a voter in one of the smaller states under the present system.

Beyond this is the fact that most of the presidential candidates come from the big states because of the importance of carrying those states in the electoral count. Under a direct-election system, these unnatural influences would be largely eliminated, and one man's vote would count for as much as any others. No doubt this is why the polls show that a direct-election amendment is popular in the small states as well as in the large ones and that it has the support of many small-state Senators and Representatives.

Mr. Gossett was equally forthright in his contention that direct election of the President would have no unfortunate repercussions on the two-party system. Indeed, he insisted that the electoral college, as it now operates, gives a great incentive to third parties. That was very pointedly demonstrated last fall when George Wallace made a strong appeal for votes on the ground that he and his supporters could assume a king-making role by the manipulation of electoral votes if neither of the major parties received an electoral majority.

In a direct election of the President, of course, there would be no electoral votes and therefore nothing to give a third-party candidate influence or standing beyond the actual votes cast for him at the polls. The president of the Bar Association concluded: "Close analysis proves that direct election will actually strengthen the two-party system—not weaken it—by removing special incentives to third parties and equalizing all voters throughout the Nation."

One strengthening factor would be the spread of the two-party system to the entire country. "Safe" Democratic or Republican states could no longer be taken for granted because whole states would no longer swing into one column or the other, but the presidential candidate of each would have only the actual votes directly cast for him by the people.

It is well to remember that the proposed amendment sponsored by the Bar Association and many others provides for a run-off election if no presidential candidate should obtain 40 per cent of the popular vote. This would eliminate the necessity for an election ever to be thrown into the House of Representatives. It would also have the effect of eliminating any third party in the run-off, if such a party should gain sufficient strength to deny the leading candidate 40 per cent of the vote, which is highly unlikely.

Mr. Gossett was a member of the Bar Association's committee which made an exhaustive study of the country's electoral problem. His comments should help to lay to rest many of the loose arguments that are being made against a system that would really let the people elect their own President.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1969]
IN THE NATION: SOME ARE MORE EQUAL,
ET CETERA

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—After the fears aroused by the 1968 election, the time seemed as ripe as it would ever be for fundamental reform of the way in which we elect Presidents. But the time is never really ripe for fundamental reform, and the election effort is in danger of bogging down, for two predictable reasons.

One is that while most members of Congress and officials are for doing something, not enough are agreed on what it ought to be. The Senate subcommittee on constitutional amendments, for example, now lines up about as follows:

Senators Bayh of Indiana and Tydings of Maryland for direct popular election; Senators Ervin of North Carolina and Dodd of Connecticut for proportional division of a state's electoral votes according to its popular votes; Senator Hruska of Nebraska for assigning an electoral vote to each Congressional district; Senator Fong of Hawaii and Thurmond of South Carolina for either the proportional or the district plan; Senators Eastland of Mississippi and Dirksen of Illinois, fluid.

The other major problem is the ironic misconceptions many politicians hold, almost as articles of faith, about direct popular election—which happens to be the only reform plan that has great public support (79 percent in the latest Harris poll on the subject) and that would eliminate all, not just some, of the dangers of the Electoral College system.

These misconceptions, nevertheless, have produced an opposition to the direct voting plan that rests largely on two directly contradictory propositions, neither of which is true—that direct popular voting would damage the interests of the small states, or else that it would damage the interests of the large states. (Neither small nor large states, of course, have any necessary similarity of interests, not even rural or urban; Texas and Michigan are large states with substantial rural interests; Rhode Island and Connecticut are small but urban states.)

NO SMALL-STATE ADVANTAGE

The small-state argument holds no water at all. It is based on the fact that the automatic assignment of at least two electoral votes to every state gives greater proportional representation in the Electoral College to the voters of sparsely populated states. Alaska, for instance, gets one electoral vote for only 75,389 persons, while California gets one for 392,930 persons. This looks good on paper; but in politics Alaska's "advantage" is worth less than Wally Hickel's standing with the Sierra Club. California still casts forty electoral votes to Alaska's three. And anyone who doesn't understand what that means need only count how many Presidential candidates visited Nome or Fairbanks last year.

POPULAR VOTE BENEFIT

In fact, the twelve largest states in the Electoral College could choose a President with 281 votes, no matter what the other 38 states did. And the power of Alaskans and other small-state residents in a Presidential election would be substantially enhanced, not reduced, by direct popular voting. That is because, under the system in which a state popular-vote winner takes all of that state's electoral votes, the ballots of those who supported the loser are completely negated; in popular voting, they would be counted equally with the votes of every other voter in every other state.

This does not mean, however, that the people of the big states would be damaged by popular voting—although it is true that the ability of those states to dominate the

Electoral College (which they have in fact seldom done; witness 1968) would be reduced. These states would remain the major population centers, and Presidential candidates would continue, in Barry Goldwater's phrase, to "hunt ducks where the ducks are." Does anyone imagine that New York and California would not remain the prime hunting grounds of Presidential candidates? Or that candidates and Presidents would not conduct themselves generally in such a manner as to appeal to urban voters?

While urban-based minority groups might lose some of their power over big blocks of electoral votes, is there any longer a justification for that advantage now that the one-man, one-vote rulings are putting an end to rural-dominated state legislatures? All minority-group votes would be counted, moreover, under the direct election plan; those of blacks who voted for Hubert Humphrey in Illinois, for example, were negated when Richard Nixon took all that state's electoral votes in 1968.

Neither the small states nor the large states, in short, would suffer from direct voting. The people of one would only become as important as the people of the other—no more and no less.

PILOT AND TWO MARINES KILLED IN ACTION

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, WO1 Normand P. Perron, Pfc. Howard E. Wright, and Pfc. Barry W. Smith, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PILOT, TWO MARINES KILLED IN ACTION

Three sons of Maryland residents—a helicopter pilot and two marines—were killed last week as a result of hostile action in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported.

The dead were:

WO1 Normand P. Perron, USA, the 23-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert V. Perron, of 613 Carolyn road, Glen Burnie, who was killed Wednesday when the helicopter he was piloting was shot down.

Pfc. Howard E. Wright, USMC, the son of William H. Wright, of 6815 Riverdale road, Riverdale, Md. Private Wright was killed in action last Sunday.

Pfc. Barry W. Smith, USMC, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Mehrl O. Smith, of 5806 63d place, East Riverdale, Md., who was killed in action Wednesday.

Mr. Perron, whose father was a career Air Force man, was enrolled in the architecture school of the University of Texas at Austin when he volunteered for the Army in the spring of 1967.

HONOR SOCIETY STUDENT

He had graduated from John Marshall High School in San Antonio, where he was a National Honor Society student, and attended San Antonio College for two years.

Mr. Perron was "always interested in flying," his mother said yesterday. After his basic training he took a year's training at Fort Rucker, Ala., where he graduated last June as a helicopter pilot. He arrived in Vietnam July 1.

He flew both supply and combat missions for seven months, and wrote his parents before his craft crashed and burned last week

that he hoped what he was doing was "not in vain."

Mr. Perron enjoyed electronics and designing buildings, his mother said.

He will be buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Funeral arrangements were incomplete yesterday, pending the arrival of his body from Vietnam.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to make Vietnam prisoners of war eligible for detention payments provided to World War II and Korean prisoners of war.

Although the sting of the ferocity of Communist treatment of American prisoners of war in Korea had begun to fade with the passage of time, our memories have been dramatically refreshed by recent disclosures of the inhuman treatment of the *Pueblo* crew members at the hands of their North Korean captors. We share the agonies of what they endured in 11 months of captivity, but I know my thoughts and yours turn to the many American servicemen still being held in North Vietnamese prisons today.

According to statistics supplied by the Department of Defense, there are presently 333 known American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and almost a thousand listed as missing, many of whom are presumed to be in Communist captivity. Although these figures seem small when compared with the staggering casualty statistics of the war, we must not overlook their present and undetermined future.

There are a number of POW wives and families in my district of San Diego, Calif. I have talked at length with some of these ladies in Washington and San Diego and cannot convey the continual anxiety they experience because of their husbands' indefinite or often unknown status. Even in cases where they have had reason to believe that their husbands are alive in Communist prisons, many have had no word in 1, 2, or more years.

Congress must not forget these men. I am pleased that one important bill was approved in 1967, Public Law 90-122, to make it possible for prisoners of war to participate in the benefits of the uniformed services savings deposit program. This is a small recompense indeed. I feel that the POW detention payments provided by the War Claims Act of 1948 and subsequent amendments should be extended to Vietnam prisoners. However, in view of the two decades since the original passage of this legislation I feel that the amounts should be increased substantially and would urge that the amount for inadequate food be raised from \$1 per day to \$2.50 per day and the payment for inhumane treatment or unauthorized labor, from \$1.50 to \$2.50 per day. I feel such

amounts are realistic in view of the present day value of the dollar.

In consideration of the amount to be paid, I think we should take into account the fact that our Government at the termination of World War II, more than 20 years ago, paid every enemy prisoner in American prisons \$2.40 per day. I feel it is not unreasonable for the United States to pay our own POW servicemen or their survivors an amount greater than that authorized for enemy prisoners who were not inadequately fed or treated inhumanely by the United States during World War II.

I would like to explain one additional amendment contained in my bill. Although the number of known civilian prisoners of war, or more accurately internees, is not great, nonetheless, I do not feel that they should be ignored if we are going to update the War Claims Act benefits.

Civilian internees received \$60 per month for adults and \$25 per month for those under 18 under the old War Claims Act. I again feel that these amounts should be increased and would suggest figures of \$75 and \$30 respectively.

The need for action on legislation to benefit our often forgotten prisoners of war is imperative, and I hope that favorable action will be taken on my bill.

METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH HOLDS ITS CENTENNIAL SUNDAY SERVICES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 2, the Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church held its centennial Sunday services. The congregation was honored to hear an eloquent and challenging sermon by Dr. Ralph Sockman, recognized as one of the foremost clergymen of all denominations in this country. I would like to include the description of Dr. Sockman as printed in Sunday's program:

We are honored to have as our guest preacher, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, recognized as one of the foremost clergymen of all denominations in this country. A native of Ohio, he is a graduate of Ohio Wesleyan and Columbia Universities and Union Theological Seminary, and recipient of over twenty-five honorary degrees. He has the unique record of having served forty-four years in his first and only pastorate, Christ Church Methodist, New York City, retiring in 1961. From 1928 to 1962 Dr. Sockman ministered weekly to listeners throughout this country and Canada on the National Radio Pulpit.

He is currently chairman of the Men's Committee for the Japan International Christian University in Tokyo, and Director of the Hall of Fame for Great Americans. He was most recently honored as recipient of the Gold Medal Award for service to humanity given by the National Institute of Social Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to hear this great preacher on this occasion. Dr. Sockman's sermon, "The End of the Be-

gining," was a challenge to the congregation as he commented on the Book of Acts—our heritage through Christ, as the Prince, and our future as the pioneering spirit of the present prevails.

As the Metropolitan Church has honored us, I would like now to honor it on the anniversary of 100 years of service to the Nation's Capital.

One hundred years—imagine the impact this great church has made upon the leaders of our country during the last century.

Even today, the church continues spreading its good; one of our own number is minister emeritus. Dr. Edward G. Latch, Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, served many productive years as minister of Metropolitan Church. Dr. James Montgomery and several others have shared this honor.

Mr. Speaker, the accompanying article by Rev. Merrill Drennan is an eloquent illustration of the growth of this magnificent church. I include it in the Record, for the benefit of all:

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF METROPOLITAN MEMORIAL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church is celebrating during the year 1969 the one-hundredth anniversary of its founding as the National Methodist Church in the city of Washington. The first church was erected on the southwest corner of John Marshall Place and C Streets, N.W., as a result of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which met in Boston in May 1852. Thereafter contributions from persons in the Washington area and throughout the nation were received and on February 28, 1869, the first services were held. General and Mrs. Ulysses S. Grant, Speaker of the House and later Vice President Schuyler Colfax, and Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase and other dignitaries of the federal and city governments attended this service, which was five days prior to the inauguration of General Grant. From 1869 until 1930 the church performed a significant ministry to the residents of the city of Washington and to those who were in Washington employed by the federal government both in the civil service and in the military. The ministers of the church were nationally prominent, and two of them, Dr. John P. Newman and Dr. Frank M. Bristol, subsequently were elected Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church while serving Metropolitan Church. Others prominent in the federal government to attend regularly during these years were President William McKinley, Vice President Charles W. Fairbanks, General John A. Logan and Mayor of Washington Matthew G. Emery.

In 1930 due to the previous expansion of the park system adjacent to the United States Capitol, the construction of Union Station, and the general changing of the community from residential to government and business, the congregation of the church elected to relocate in Wesley Heights in the upper northwest section of the city. There on a triangular plot of ground gently arising above Nebraska and New Mexico Avenues opposite The American University, the Sanctuary was constructed and the first services were held February 7, 1932.

The plan of the church is cruciform, following the traditional plan, with a great nave arising from a height of seventy feet from the curb and is surmounted by a fleche or slender spire reminiscent of Saint Chapelle in Paris. The general character is in keeping with the Gothic spirit with a touch of the flamboyant in its traceried windows and detail, symbolical of the eternal flame. Al-

though late Gothic in spirit, a touch of the modern is freely admitted, with the best of the spirit and idealism of the age in which the edifice is erected.

Since the church is the expression in Washington of Methodism of America, it was felt essential that the materials used in it should be drawn from the nation at large. So we find copper from Arizona for the roof; limestone from Indiana for the trim; precast stone from Ohio in the interior; slate from Vermont for the floors; flaggings from Pennsylvania and New York; southern American walnut for the trim; for the open timber roof, redwood from California, the "ever-lasting wood"; steel from Pittsburgh; steel sash from Michigan; and hardware from Connecticut, and so forth.

The nave, chancel, and choir seat nine hundred persons. The choir separates the nave from the tomb altar. The whole treatment of the interior has sought to lead the eye of the worshiper up to the chancel. Here a simple limestone slab carries the Cross, the emblem of the faith. Vases display flowers to remind the worshiper of God's creation and beauty. The candlesticks by their light recall the presence of the Holy Spirit. A stone frame carries the dorsal cloth and above the lintel the wall is pierced by a rose window filled with richly colored glass containing the dove in downward flight, symbolizing the descent of the Holy Spirit. Other carvings and symbolic materials are appropriately placed. Also memorial plaques commemorate the services of former members.

Subsequently, a Parish Hall was erected adjacent to the Sanctuary in 1951, with the most recent addition being an enlargement of the Sanctuary consecrated just ten years ago.

Today, under the direction of the Rev. Merrill W. Drennan and his associate ministers, the church has a full program of worship, educational, and social activities ministering to a congregation numbering over 3,000 members. Its service and missionary endeavors reach the community, the nation, and the world. Each Sunday there is attracted a large number of worshipers who are new residents of the community or who are visiting Washington and want to attend the National Methodist Church.

Several of the ministers of Metropolitan Church have served in the chaplaincy of the Congress. Among these are Dr. James Shera Montgomery and Dr. Edward Gardiner Latch, the current Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The present congregation is indeed grateful for the devotion of all the members in its century of service to the Washington community. They look forward to a second century when in addition to serving its own membership it will be successful in the inspiration and training of Methodist Christians to become witnesses and servants of Jesus Christ to the community. As the world changes, so the church must change its ministry of mission, retaining only those facets of its witness which have proved essential and timeless, and adding that which fulfills the diverse needs of the generations to come. Hopefully, with wisdom and foresight, and God's help, the church can formulate a strategy for service, and provide the bridge by which the church of the grandparents can become the church of the grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I would also call attention to a book prepared by the church entitled "A Living Centennial." This publication details the history of the church in enlightening fashion and chronicles the beginnings of Methodism. In my opinion, this book is excellent reading for everyone, whether they be of this faith or another.

"MAD" ON GAMES OF CHANCE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I testified today before the Federal Trade Commission which is considering a proposed regulation on "games of chance" in the food and gasoline retailing businesses.

I include below my prepared testimony and a poem from the April 1969 issue of Mad magazine which I also read to the Commission. The poem said, in far fewer words than I took, what is wrong with these "games of chance."

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, MARCH 3, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to discuss the Proposed Trade Regulation on "games of chance" in the food retailing and gasoline industries. These proceedings take on an added sense of urgency in view of the recently announced increases in the wholesale price of gasoline and in view of the spiraling cost of food.

The use of games of chance to bring customers into a supermarket or service station is a practice that has mushroomed during recent years. Based on a week of ad hoc consumer hearings that I held earlier this month in upstate New York, I discovered that it is a practice widely condemned by the consuming public. A significant number of witnesses in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Albany testified that supermarket and service station games are fraudulent and expensive. That testimony, taken together with letter received by my Special Consumer Inquiry, indicate widespread public dissatisfaction not simply with the mechanics of the games but with their very existence.

My own conclusion is that these games are inherently deceptive. Their use to build consumer traffic would also seem to be legally questionable and morally indefensible. If they were measured by the same legal yardstick we use to determine "obscenity", I am convinced that the Supreme Court would unanimously adjudge them to be "utterly without redeeming social value". For the overwhelming majority of consumers who have never managed to win at "Bonus Bingo" or "Win-At-the-Races" (and whose friends have never won), they are also utterly without redeeming monetary value!

The proliferation of these games suggests to me two things:

First, that a sizable segment of the business community has again demonstrated its apathy towards furthering the public interest. By serving as willing accomplices in the arbitrary and expensive manipulation of consumer choice, food retailers may have unwittingly answered their own question (first posed during the 1966 supermarket boycotts)—"What have we done to make the housewives so angry?"

Second, the use of games of chance to establish customer loyalty is an all-too-familiar example of the breakdown in our "competitive" free enterprise system. Frequently the salient question for consumers in the food or gasoline marketplace today is not whether the prices, goods, and services offered by Safeway are better than those offered by A&P or Humble's better than Sunoco's; but whether Safeway's "Bonus bingo" is more enticing than A&P's

"Three-of-a-Kind." And whether Humble's "Tigerino" is more appealing than Sunoco's "Sunny Dollars". This is hardly free enterprise at its best!

What, then, do we know about these "games of chance"?

We know that they resemble gambling. But personally, if I have to gamble I think I can get better odds in Las Vegas than in a supermarket or gas station.

We also know, or at least have been told, that with some minor exceptions, consumers, retailers, and even suppliers are not completely happy with the games. Consumers, of course, are angry about the deception and cost of the games; gasoline station retailers frequently find that purchase of the games results in a profit-squeeze; and some studies indicate that when the market becomes saturated with games, they are of little or no benefit in increasing traffic.

What then of a solution? I am convinced that the Proposed Trade Regulation falls to meet the principal consumer objections to the games of chance.

The Federal Trade Commission's own staff study indicates that 70% of the consumer complaints directed against the games relate to the belief that they are in some way fraudulent and that they are a significant factor in the high cost of food and gasoline. Apart from the irrefutable disclosures of occasional rigging of prizes, my own view is that consumer charges of fraud and deception are steeped in the simple truism that too many game players lose—that the chances of winning are simply too slight! Even if the Proposed Rule is adopted and fully implemented, the number of winners will not increase and charges of fraud by disappointed consumers will still be heard!

Nor will the Proposed Regulation combat the second major consumer complaint—that the games add to the already high cost of food and gasoline. To the contrary, by legitimizing the games by eliminating the threat of further FTC action, the games will probably flourish!

It is apparent to me, therefore, that the only solution to the problem and, indeed, the only way the Commission can promote the consumer interest, is to prohibit the games entirely. By any responsible measure, games of chance have no proper place and perform no useful function, in the American marketplace.

One final thought. If the Federal Trade Commission should declare the games unlawful—or, if they are eventually eliminated by the voluntary actions of suppliers and retailers, then it is incumbent upon some agency of government—preferably the Bureau of Labor Statistics—to report to the American people whether the anticipated dollar savings to retailers are being passed along to consumers in the form of reduced prices.

GAMES PEOPLE PLAY

In Esso's "Tigerama",
In Mobil's "Safety Pays",
In each and every contest,
I'm the one who plays.

More give-aways I've entered
Than I could even name,
But haven't won a penny
From a single game.

I fall for "Easy Money"
The food chains advertise,
I've got a million coupons,
But as yet no prize.

At piling up a fortune
However, I've a shot,
If only I could match up
Half the halves I've got.

I clutch with mounting frenzy
In my hot little hand,
Each perforated promise
Of a hundred grand.

My contemplated riches
I willingly would split
With anyone who holds a
Corresponding fit.

But other almost-winners
With whom I've tried for pairs,
All find my missing pieces
Coincide with theirs.

A faint suspicion rises
(Excuse my hollow laugh!)
That no press ever printed
Any matching half.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 6612—a bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for aid or assistance thereunder—I am concerned that we face up to the deficiencies in our present welfare system and work to correct them.

The plain fact is that the traditional patterns of public welfare in existence in this country today are not adequate or realistic; and in point of fact, public welfare as it is structured and administered today is one of the great failures in Government attempts to meet the needs of people.

H.R. 6612 would provide for national minimum standards of welfare to be applied in all of the States. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be given the power to set minimum standards for the amount of aid or assistance given. He would set standards for determining the manner in which other income or resources would be taken into account in determining who is eligible for assistance. Such standards would not be rigid; but would take into account differing requirements of classes of individuals to whom assistance programs apply and the varying cost levels in different geographic areas—but only to the extent that would insure all individuals receive the same net benefit. This policy was recommended in 1966 by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare which was set up by the 87th Congress. President Nixon's task force on public assistance made a similar recommendation. Recently, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, endorsed the idea.

Our present welfare system makes no one happy. Though basic approaches to the problems of poverty may vary, philosophical opponents all find common ground for criticism whenever the topic is before us.

In supporting the establishment of minimum welfare standards as a partial solution to the problem, I start from a basic premise: Each individual has the right to be free from starvation, the right not to have his body and mind permanently scarred by early malnutrition. He has a right to a decent education and

a decent job, in other words, the right to be given a chance to become a contributing member of society. These rights belong to a person by virtue of his being a human being and an American citizen. His accidental geographic location in one State or another should have nothing to do with these rights.

Yet, under our present system, to whatever extent public assistance helps to obtain these ends, its benefits are unequally applied from State to State. In my own State of Michigan the average monthly "aid to families with dependent children" payment per family for 1965 was \$147.09. In Mississippi it was \$33.19. The average payment per recipient in Michigan was \$35.99. In Mississippi it was \$8.16. Michigan ranked 15th in the Nation on level of payments. Mississippi ranked 50th.

This inequality is disturbing. It encourages the movement of families from States with low payments to States with high payments. It encourages the movement from rural areas to urban areas. In Michigan we already have well over 155,000 recipients of aid to families with dependent children. The heavy increase in numbers of persons on welfare rolls in the industrial centers, such as the Detroit metropolitan area is due more to the migration of people into the area, encouraged by present welfare patterns, than a failure of our own public and private efforts to meet the problem.

The measure which we propose would remedy this situation in two ways. It would make payments standard throughout the country and it would make eligibility requirements standard, thereby discouraging migration to a State or area with less stringent requirements.

But there is another aspect to the problem. Many of the States which are making the biggest effort are not receiving a share of the Federal assistance that is proportionate to their effort. As I mentioned before, Michigan ranked 15th in the Nation in the level of welfare payments and Mississippi ranked 50th. However, the rankings are reversed when it comes to the amount of Federal support for each State. Michigan ranked low—36th in amount of per capita Federal grants for public assistance, \$12.90, while Mississippi ranked 10th with \$21.20 per capita Federal grants for public assistance. These figures begin to fall into a pattern when one looks at the breakdown of total payments under all Federal-State public assistance programs by source of funds. For fiscal year 1965 in Michigan the breakdown was:

From Federal funds.....	\$91,700,000
From State funds.....	77,800,000
From local funds.....	39,100,000

In Mississippi, however, the breakdown was:

From Federal funds.....	\$44,800,000
From State funds.....	10,400,000
From local funds.....	200,000

Looking at similar statistics for other States, it becomes clear that Michigan is making a far bigger effort at the State and local level than are many other States.

The individual welfare recipient should not have the amount of his assistance de-

terminated solely by this factor coupled with the geographic location of his home. Population migration should not be encouraged on this basis alone—which is unfortunately now the case. We should substitute rational market considerations of available jobs and labor force needs and skills for the present diversity in amount of State welfare payments if we are ever to begin to break the iron grip that poverty holds on many of our citizens.

To encourage a rural family with no skills to move to an urban area or State is more than useless, it is cruel and it is dangerous because it arouses expectations that cannot be fulfilled. That family will arrive in the urban area without prior training and without job skills. They will soon discover that the job market is not open to those without skills. They will discover that the supposedly high welfare payments that induced them to migrate in the first place do not go as far as the same amount would have gone in a rural area. More likely than not the resulting frustrations they feel will add them to the large numbers of disenfranchised in the already explosive situation in our cities.

STATEMENT OF PAUL W. BRIGGS, SUPERINTENDENT OF CLEVELAND, OHIO, PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR ON THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, FEBRUARY 3, 1969

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest school superintendents in the United States is Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of schools in Cleveland, Ohio.

Because I think Mr. Briggs' experience in utilizing programs made possible by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to be of broad interest, I insert at this point in the RECORD, his testimony of February 3, 1969, before the House Committee on Education:

STATEMENT OF PAUL W. BRIGGS, SUPERINTENDENT, CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CLEVELAND, OHIO, TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 3, 1969

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Paul W. Briggs, Superintendent of Cleveland Public Schools. I appreciate very much the opportunity of appearing before this committee to present testimony regarding the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

TO ATTACK URBAN CRISIS

This landmark piece of legislation and the added financial support which it has made available have enabled the Cleveland schools to mount an attack of significant magnitude on what I believe is America's number one domestic problem—the urban crisis.

Our strategy in developing programs under terms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been to focus on the major problems in urban living as they relate to education.

Among these major problems are the following: Isolation, poverty, unemployment, and drabness.

The impact of these problems on education is reflected in undermotivation, depressed achievement, excessive dropping out, and continuing misunderstanding and suspicion between groups.

We find the school attempting to teach hungry children, children who perceive no opportunity for themselves in the broader society, children whose associations have been limited only to children similar to themselves.

We have children whose creative talents and tastes in the arts have been sadly neglected, children to whom the wonders of nature remain remote pictures, children whose reading experiences are limited to classroom instruction periods.

In attacking these problems we have used the available resources provided under all applicable Titles and we have applications now pending in the U.S. Office of Education under Titles VII and VIII. Today, however, I should like to discuss especially Titles I and III.

As I move about the city of Cleveland, visiting its many schools and neighborhoods, I am continually impressed with the need for better educational opportunities throughout the city and especially in areas of great poverty and deprivation.

The severity of the problem is compounded by the fact that American education must move into the space age, an age that requires progressively higher levels of competence and skill, supported and reinforced by the best scientific "know how" available. This is an age that demands superior education for all our citizens.

Basic to good education is a sound program of community schools sensitive to and efficiently serving an ever-expanding list of neighborhood needs. Inherent in this space age, though, is a demand for new educational and cultural experiences not now or likely soon to be available at the neighborhood level.

TITLE III—COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROGRAM

In Cleveland we have faced up to this need and with the support of funds provided under Title III we have been operating since October, 1966 a prototype supplementary educational center.

Here in a converted warehouse in downtown Cleveland we bring together each day 500 children from across the city for special instruction in science, in local history, and in music. We have been able to assemble in this center a staff of creative master teachers; and having provided for their use highly sophisticated equipment, there is immediately available a wide range of exceptionally strong learning experiences to be shared by children from throughout the city.

Here children are introduced to the wonders of space in a planetarium which is surrounded by always current exhibits and life size models provided by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They take a simulated trip in a submarine to taste the excitement of oceanography.

Their understanding of the heritage of their city is deepened as skillful teachers lead them through a day in early Cleveland in authenticated settings. Their appreciation of good music is enhanced as talented professional musicians perform and patiently explain the music and their instruments. For those with keener interest in music, group and individual instruction is offered by the most outstanding professional musicians and teachers of the area. A climax of the music program each season is the production of an original work composed by the children and produced by them.

Through this prototype supplementary center we have demonstrated the basic soundness of the concept. (The program of the center includes only those activities which cannot be economically or effectively carried out by some other means—in the neighborhood school, in a museum, or through radio or television.) It is now clear

that such a center will provide an added dimension of enriched educational experiences which can be shared by the many diverse groups of children that make up the city's population.

At this time we are working cooperatively with the administration of the city of Cleveland to locate a suitable site for the construction of a permanent center which will serve up to 1,000 children daily and thus not only increase the depth of the experience for each child but increase the frequency of pupil-to-pupil association in these shared experiences.

CLEVELAND TITLE I PROGRAM

I should like to turn now to Title I and to our experiences in Cleveland.

The plight of thousands of children in the depressed inner city is the most serious challenge this nation has faced at home during the twentieth century.

Title I has provided resources which have helped schools address themselves to this challenge.

In Cleveland with a school enrollment of 153,000 children, we have 7 per cent of the total public school population of Ohio. But we have more than 30 per cent of the total number of children in Ohio who receive public assistance, and the proportion is increasing. Today more than one-fifth of all the children in Cleveland schools are members of families subsisting at poverty levels.

If schools and schooling are to be relevant, they must do more than teach the literature, history and culture of yesterday or the mathematics, science and economics of tomorrow. They must become the doors of opportunity for the denied, the underprivileged, the underchallenged, the undereducated, and the undermotivated.

Our philosophy in Title I programming is based upon a firm belief in the fairly even distribution throughout society of intellectual capacity and abilities. Long exposure to poverty and its debilitating influences has submerged the abilities and talents of the disadvantaged as they have struggled to subsist.

It is the task of the school to create an environment and to marshal the resources that will discover, develop, define and encourage the abilities and talents of all children to the fullest possible extent.

We have attempted not only to strengthen the learning skills of disadvantaged pupils but also to improve the competence of the school as an institution to identify and respond to the needs of inner-city children.

Mounting programs of the size and scope of those under Title I is not without problems, particularly in a large school system. It required time to establish an organization within the school system to administer the program in a manner that would assure its compliance with the intent of Congress. It was not easy to locate the 700 additional staff members and to prepare them for their new responsibilities. There was no backlog of instructional materials and equipment. Schedules had to be adjusted. Parents and other community leaders had to be consulted and in some instances building alterations were required.

Our analysis of critical needs has indicated that particular attention should be directed to articulation points in the child's movement through school, that is, in the earliest years of his school experience, at the time he moves from elementary to junior high school, from the junior high grades to the senior high, and as he approaches decision points regarding dropping out or continuing on to graduation.

Also, it seems to us that for the greatest long-range benefits, proportionately more resources and efforts should be devoted to younger children.

During the current school year, the Cleveland Title I Program consists of 14 projects being conducted in a total of 72 schools, directly serving 15,000 eligible children. The

heaviest concentration of programming is in 20 elementary schools serving the most impoverished areas of the city. Our projects range from pre-kindergarten child development to job development, orientation, and placement for inner-city high school seniors.

They include efforts to improve instruction in reading and mathematics and to identify specific pupil difficulties in these areas. There is a special project for children for whom English is a new language. In both elementary and secondary Title I schools, we have provided tutors—college students who are available for immediate help and support. We are modifying curricula in junior high schools to recapture the interest of students identified as likely to drop out.

For the past three summers, we have conducted large summer school projects which have put educational, recreational, and cultural activities within walking distance of every eligible child in Cleveland.

Our experience with fully operational Title I projects covers a period of two school years. This is not long enough for the accumulation of totally conclusive data regarding the effectiveness of this massive program. It must be remembered that we are attempting to overcome generations of neglect. Furthermore, we are not dealing here with a laboratory type situation which lends itself readily to evaluation techniques. We are engaged in broad field type settings where we cannot control many of the factors that influence results.

However, the data we have been able to gather do indicate a hopeful trend. For example:

There has been a consistent significant gain in reading skill among pupils in our reading improvement projects; boys particularly have shown strong improvement.

Children who have participated in our pre-kindergarten project have performed in kindergarten and first grade well beyond the rates of comparable children without such services.

In a special project for seriously intellectually underdeveloped though not mentally retarded children between 5 and 8 there was an increase in I.Q. of from 5 to 19 points for one-third of the children participating.

Children in remedial mathematics groups have shown significant gain as compared to similar children not receiving such special attention.

At the senior high school level, schools receiving Title I services experienced a 10 per cent decrease in the dropout rate last school year, as compared to the preceding year.

One of our most impressive results has been achieved in our job development project where nine out of every ten participants secured full time employment in Cleveland business and industry.

We will continue to monitor all our Title I projects closely to determine whether such gains are retained and accelerated.

At this point though we find the early returns encouraging.

In an effort to use available monies to produce the greatest yield for children, we have frequently coupled Title I funds with other federal resources, as well as with state and local monies. An example of this approach is in the field of nutrition. Here we used Title I funds, two years ago, to equip a large, modern kitchen in a building purchased with local funds to develop a lunch and nutrition education project for inner-city children. We shall use the resources of the federally supported school lunch program to provide food for the several thousand children who will benefit from this service.

There are other examples. We have used funds available under the Vocational Education Act in conjunction with ESEA funds in extending vocational educational motivation and opportunities. In other instances, we have supplemented ESEA funds with private foundation grants.

Throughout all such efforts our accent and focus are on improved opportunities for children—the children most in need.

COMMENTS EVALUATION

Certain potential long range effects of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are becoming apparent. Projects and services conducted under provisions of this legislation have enabled schools to examine the creativity, resourcefulness, and readiness for change of staff members who have had new opportunities for leadership functions. In Cleveland, the staff member who this year was promoted and given responsibility for the pre-first grade programs throughout the city came to our attention through her excellent work in organizing and developing our head start and child development project—one of the nation's finest.

Another significant long range benefit that Title I has brought to the schools of Cleveland is an emerging new staffing pattern through which the competencies of more people at various levels of training are being utilized. This includes teacher aides, assistant teachers, tutors, parent educators, home-school liaison aides, technicians, and other expanding classifications. In these roles, many inner-city residents including parents are entering a new relationship and involvement in education. This is good for children and good for their parents.

While our experiences in developing and implementing Title I projects have in general been encouraging, we have encountered some disappointments and frustrations.

Delays in funding have impeded proper planning and staffing. I certainly hope that Congress will provide forward funding so that intelligent planning and orderly implementation of projects can occur. Also with respect to funding, I would urge that appropriations be made at the full level of authorization. In addition, consideration should be given to normal increases in costs such as regular salary increment for staff.

The restrictive character of certain regulations has made it difficult to organize and administer Title I projects in the most educationally sound manner. For example, we are restricted pretty much to the delivery of remedial type services, rather than to a much needed emphasis on prevention.

Last summer we developed a large program in the Arts in an attempt to not only increase the artistic skills and cultivate the interests of inner-city children but also to attack the isolation of groups of children from each other. It was permissible to provide transportation out of the ghetto for inner-city children but not allowable to use Title I funds to bring other children into the center we established so that the benefits of greater association would be possible. This project is described briefly in a recent publication of the U.S. Office of Education entitled "Profiles in Quality Education," containing descriptions of 150 outstanding Title I projects.

We had to discontinue Title I funding of a very rich and exciting camping project because we were serving children in classes from the schools in high poverty areas rather than segregating and selecting only those suffering from serious retardation in academic achievement. Following such procedures is educationally unsound as it ignores the motivation and learning experiences that children gain through association with other more able classmates.

In effect, Title I guidelines lead to setting up a special track system for disadvantaged children.

With respect to the methods of distributing ESEA assistance, we have found the present method followed under Title I to be effective. It has distributed the money in relation to the needs of children rather than in response to the literary skill of proposal writers or the sophistication in grantmanship of local administrators.

I would certainly hope that any system of distributing federal assistance would include safeguards to insure that funds are distributed in such a way that the money goes where the children are the neediest.

ESEA was enacted by Congress in an attempt "to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the nation's elementary and secondary schools."

The national program that has been established as a result of that act has provided the vehicle with which this nation can move its educational efforts ahead the required giant stride.

It seems to me that we are at the point where we have the experience in planning and program development and have operated a sufficient number of model projects long enough to be ready now to move forward confidently in the productive programs that the national interest demands but which no school system in a big city can alone support.

SPECIAL BULK MAILING RATE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, again this year I am introducing legislation to extend to neighborhood improvement associations the use of the special third-class bulk mailing permit.

Thousands of grassroots neighborhood associations throughout the country are currently involved in efforts to maintain and strengthen residential neighborhoods. Virtually every neighborhood in my district, Minneapolis, has its own local community group that promotes public improvements, encourages property upkeep and provides a "watchdog" service for zoning changes. Activities of this type are particularly important in a central city like Minneapolis that must work diligently to maintain the family-residential character of its older neighborhoods.

With the advent of many new federally funded community development projects, the neighborhood associations have an increasingly important information function to perform. It is vitally important that neighborhood residents are informed about these programs and the neighborhood associations are in a good position to disseminate this information. But current postal regulations tend to limit the communication activities of the neighborhood groups. Under existing law, improvement associations are not permitted to use the special third-class bulk permit which would enable them to mail at the rate of 1.4 cents per piece. They often must use the regular third-class rate of 6 cents per 2 ounces, which causes a real financial burden.

Congress can encourage this worthwhile neighborhood improvement activity in a small but significant way by extending to the neighborhood associations the use of the special third-class permit now available to a variety of nonprofit educational and welfare organizations.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 7979

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for nonprofit organizations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4452(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or fraternal organizations of associations" and inserting in lieu thereof "fraternal, or neighborhood improvement organizations or associations".

A PENETRATING ANALYSIS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time our newspaper columnists cut through the confusion and shifting sands of contemporary affairs and strike fundamental truth with a laserlike beam which places a difficult problem in proper perspective. Frank Getlein has admirably performed this service for us with his February 12, 1969, column in the Washington Evening Star, entitled "Why View Israel as a Boy Scout?" Mr. Getlein gets to the core of the Middle East problem and I commend, therefore, his discerning column to this body, the full text of which is as follows:

WHY VIEW ISRAEL AS A BOY SCOUT?

(By Frank Getlein)

The unquestionably growing pro-Arab sentiment among Americans concerned about the Middle East is actually based on a pro-Israel assumption. The way it works is this: When the Arabs behave like bandits, assassins, spoiled children and people whose heads are made out of cement, we don't react against them because, at heart, we don't expect any better. Arabs are, after all, the inventors of assassination from an etymological point of view and famed practitioners of it from an historical one. It isn't that other people don't go in for assassination, it's just that nobody else ever formed a club on that principle.

And they were on pot before this country was even discovered. And they haggle in the marketplace instead of calculating through the check-out counter. And they believe in bribery as a fringe benefit of public service. And they have been ruled, most of them, by "kings" arbitrarily chosen by European powers and who act the part like Alfred Drake in "Kismet" without the voice. And this and that and so much else.

In short, we don't really take the Arabs seriously and, except for oil and common humanity, there is no reason why we should.

With Israel, quite the other way. We expect the Israeli to live up to the law of nations, to behave unto others as they would wish others to behave unto them and, for that matter, as we faintly wish we could afford to behave ourselves.

The trouble with the law of nations, of course, is that it is a very long time since any big nation has actually obeyed it. According to the grand old rule of decorum among the governments of the world, for instance, no Russian government would dream of invading Czechoslovakia, yet who's directing Prague traffic today? No American government would invade Cuba or the Dominican Republic, yet why isn't the popular choice for Dominican rule in office? No British government would have invaded Ireland and left

behind a colony of foreigners in the north that is now causing all the trouble there. No French government would have tried to conquer the Vietnamese and so on. Yet all these things have happened.

The reason they have happened is that all those countries doing all those frightful things are major powers. The only way you stop a major power from transgressing the law of nations is by the fact or the threat of a major war. Since nobody wants a major war—except sometimes—big powers pretty well do as they wish and how many divisions does the court of world opinion have?

With Israel, the hope here is that we can impose standards of conduct we don't care to live up to ourselves but admire a good deal for others. The theory seems to be that if we can just make the Israelis obey the Boy Scout Law by force, this will be a big step toward the abolition of force in world affairs.

Fat chance. Under present and foreseeable conditions, force is the only ultimate way international affairs can be managed. The dream for the Middle East is that the United Nations can establish and maintain peace if only the Israelis will let it happen.

What needs to be recalled is that the United Nations was doing exactly that before the six-day war. When Nasser, the sheik of Arab, said scam, the U.N. scrambled. The fact that Israel was not wiped out at that moment was due solely to its own prudence.

With that record, it ought to be easy to understand why the Israelis aren't bowled over and all choked up by appeals to the law of nations and the United Nations and the hope of peace in our time.

For Israel, the only hope of peace in its time lies in somehow convincing the dramatic baritones they're surrounded by that it will cost them more to be nasty than it will be to be decent. It would be a wonderful world if this could be accomplished by sweet reasonableness, but so far there has been no faint sign that this can happen.

In child-raising generally, permissiveness is okay, and certainly a lot pleasanter to live with than discipline. The worst results won't happen now, but years later at the Pentagon or Columbia University or Berkeley, and at least the kid will be quiet.

But there are certain things, like setting the house on fire, that the wise parent just cannot allow to be included in the permissive approach. When the child starts to set fire to the house, what you do is you whale the tar out of him and eventually he gets the idea.

Unfortunately, that has to be Israel's foreign policy for now.

"FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE"—ADDRESS BY GAYLE P. EMERY

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasant experience for me to read the speeches prepared and delivered by young people as part of the annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary.

The winner of the Delaware State contest this year is Miss Gayl P. Emery, the 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Warren Emery, of 637 Carol Street, Dover. Gayle is a senior at Dover High School and plans to continue on to college to study speech and drama.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD Gayle's address

that she will deliver during the national finals here in Washington this week:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Gayle P. Emery)

In the Broadway musical, *Man of La Mancha*, we discover meaningful expressions which embody Freedom's Challenge.

"TO DREAM THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM"

Years ago a mere handful of visionary men sought to create a brighter land for their children, a land unique in the history of this world and the memory of mankind. We Americans have always dared to dream the impossible dream and make our dreams a reality. Our poets, our scholars, our religious leaders, our statesmen have pointed the way to the ideals of freedom, equality, and justice. We are the heirs of those sacred ideals. Only through our efforts, our understanding, and our compassion will those dreams become a reality. This dream, this hope is the guiding soul of our nation. For this dream of freedom and equality courageous American soldiers have challenged—and defeated—great tyrannical powers on every major battlefield of this world. In times of oppression, injustice, and discrimination, our forefathers dared to hope for equal rights and opportunities and the chance to be free-thinking men. We can, we must re-accept this challenge, for freedom must be re-born, re-created in the hearts and minds of each man and woman of our generation.

"TO FIGHT THE UNEBEATABLE FOE"

America has a reputation for conquering the unbeatable foe—George III, the Kaiser, Adolf Hitler—and we must continue to be dedicated to this ideal of force for freedom. Only when we lose our capacity to fight and lose faith in our ideals will a foe become unbeatable. Faith, without dedication and the will to fight, is meaningless. Today's enemies are within as well as without our beloved nation—riots in the streets, unrest on college campuses, crime at every level of our society, citizens who refuse their glorious inheritance and wallow in soul shrinking apathy. Only through our faith, our dream of equality, our will to fight, and our compassionate understanding, can we triumph over today's challenges. This is a personal responsibility, for when we call ourselves Americans, we pledge our lives, our honor, and our personal destinies to those ideals which have shaped this nation and inspired a watching world.

"TO RIGHT THE UNRIGHTABLE WRONG"

The American national symbol is the courageous eagle, not the cowardly ostrich with his head buried in the sand. Wrongs exist in any society, and this is not a damnation of that society, but any society that ignores these inherent wrongs is truly damned. These offenses comprise America's most immediate challenge. The uneducated must be given greater opportunities for education and training to earn a decent, respectable living, not an eternal welfare check. The unrest on our college campuses must be quelled with a firm demand for a greater respect for person, property, and nation. Racial tension and rioting in our cities must be brought to a halt through expressions and examples of understanding between peoples, and between the people and their government. The bitter and disillusioned senior citizen must be given a vital, creative role and the respect he enjoyed in his prime in this society. In righting these wrongs we will be creating a brighter tomorrow for our children.

"To fight for the right, without question or pause.

To be willing to march into hell for a heavenly cause."

Americans have so often accepted the challenge to fight for the right—every man's right to freedom and opportunity. We want to share the freedom we have enjoyed. Willingly, American soldiers have worked, fought,

and died on foreign shores for other men's freedom. Likewise, Americans have died on American battlefields to preserve these freedoms. If we do not accept our challenge today, all these glorious men will have died in vain.

"And I know, if I'll only be true to this glorious quest,
That my heart will lie peaceful and calm
when I'm laid to my rest.
And the world will be better for this."

To be able to secure and ensure freedom for other countries we must work to strengthen our freedom within by ridding our nation of those forces which threaten our dreams of freedom and equality. No dream is too impossible, no star is too high to be reached, as long as we remain true to these dreams and work unendingly to attain them. This is Freedom's Challenge; this is our challenge.

Mr. Speaker, amidst all the reports of student radicalism and unrest, all Americans can take pride in the vast majority of young men and women like Gayle Emery who, with quiet dignity and determination, prepare themselves for their future responsibilities as citizens.

I commend to the attention of each Member Gayle's moving speech on "Freedom's Challenge." My good wishes, like those of all Delawareans, are with her as she competes in the national finals.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE HONORED BY
VFW

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, once again Members of Congress are to be honored by that great veterans organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Each year at this time an invitation is extended to each of us to attend the annual VFW congressional dinner. On that occasion, as you know, besides honoring all Members of Congress, one of our Members is chosen to receive the highly coveted VFW Congressional Award.

I am pleased that this year our distinguished colleague, Congressman OLIN E. "TIGER" TEAGUE of Texas, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, will be the recipient of the sixth annual VFW Congressional Award. No other Member of Congress has worked so long and so hard—and I might add so fruitfully—for the veterans of our Nation. His unstinting devotion to the well-being of veterans and their dependents is well known to us all. "TIGER" TEAGUE has been chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for 15 of his 23 years as a Member of this body, a post for which he was eminently qualified and in which he has served with distinction.

He was elected to Congress in 1946, after completing a World War II military career which began as a private in the National Guard in 1939 and was ended after 6 years as a result of wounds received as a combat infantry battalion commander. While leading his battalion

from Utah Beach to the Rhine River, he was decorated for valor 11 times and suffered six wounds. He is the most decorated Member of Congress.

In addition to his chairmanship of the Veterans' Committee, "TIGER" has added to his national prestige with his record as chairman of the Subcommittees on Manned Space Flight and NASA Oversight of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. During his 8 years on the committee the United States has regained leadership in space, a comeback which culminated in the historic Apollo 8 moon flight last Christmas.

The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Richard Homan, has said of the award made to Congressman TEAGUE:

The Congressional Award, is the highest honor given by the V.F.W. It was established in 1964. The award was first presented to Senator Carl Hayden, Arizona. The 1965 recipient was Speaker of the House JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. In 1966 the award was presented to Senate Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, was honored in 1967. In 1968 Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, received the fifth award of the VFW.

By awarding this honor to one of our national legislators, the VFW seeks to dramatize the importance of the role of a freely elected legislature to serve the great ends of this Republic, maintaining true allegiance to the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws, the fostering of true patriotism, maintaining and extending the institutions of American freedom, and preserving and defending our country from all her enemies, at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, although the award to our distinguished colleague "TIGER" TEAGUE will be the highlight of the evening, the VFW congressional dinner will highlight other important aspects of this great national organization. The dinner climaxes the VFW's annual 4-day Washington conference of national officers and department commanders. This meeting represents a great opportunity for Members of the Congress to meet with our friends from back home, the officers of this great veterans organization which this year is celebrating its 70th anniversary.

The evening with the VFW also represents an opportunity to extend our congratulations to the 53 young men and women who are the winners of the 22d annual Voice of Democracy Contest. From among their number, five will be chosen national winners and the winner of the first place award will read his winning entry at the dinner. These young people are a credit to their Nation, their States and communities and, especially, to their families.

As is usual, the evening will spotlight a part of our Nation's history to which our military services have contributed. This time the focus will be on World War I and the men who fought for peace at that time. The program, I am sure, will be one befitting the traditions established at these VFW congressional dinners.

I want at this time to extend my congratulations to "TIGER" TEAGUE and to the VFW. This award represents a thank you from the Nation's veterans. In present-

ing the VFW award to "TIGER" TEAGUE these veterans honor, as well, each and every Member of the Congress. For our part, we shall continue to remember them and their sacrifices.

FORD FOUNDATION—REPRESENTATION WITHOUT TAXATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if taxation without representation is tyranny, then consider, What is representation without taxation?

On February 21, McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation and its tax-free billions spent hours seeking to justify the foundation's accumulations and political activities.

Two days later, the same McGeorge Bundy appeared on national television as a political activist to try to defeat the Sentinel antiballistic missile system which our military experts feel essential to the defense of the American people.

Most American people resent any attempt to deprive them of essential safeguards of their lives and property—but more especially they detest the overrepresentation of a powerful organization which does not even pay taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I insert several news clippings on the incredible Ford Foundation and a report by Mr. Harold Lord Varney on "How the Ford Foundation Finances Revolution" from the American Opinion magazine for November 1968 in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star,
Feb. 23, 1969]

BUNDY OPPOSES SENTINEL

NEW YORK.—McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation and key adviser on foreign and defense policy for Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, said yesterday that the Sentinel antiballistic missile system "is not needed."

In an interview prepared for Sunday airing on WNBC-TV, Bundy said that a case for the system to meet the future threat of Red Chinese missile weapons "is so far from made that it is much better to wait."

He said it is more important "to get control over the race in strategic weapons, nuclear weapons, which threatens to get out of control. . . ."

"I'm saying that turning that race down is a No. 1 problem and that there is no substitute in dealing with that problem for very strong leadership in the government of the United States," he said.

But Bundy conceded that President Nixon could have difficulty in exercising such leadership.

"There are relations between the Armed Services and the Armed Services committees, the House and the Senate," he said. "There are the famous relationships that General Eisenhower talked about in his farewell address between the interested parties and the contractors."

"There are lots of economic interests which will be affected for better, and some for worse, by a deployment of the Sentinel system. There the President is not wholly a free agent."

Bundy said he believed the real troubles in Vietnam have had "more to do with the lack

of effective control, authority and ability to make things happen within the executive branch of government."

He added that he also believes the time is coming when the war could be de-escalated.

"The fact is the situation on the ground has been going relatively well, for us and for the South Vietnamese government, for the last nine months, that it should be possible . . . that we could get on the order of 100,000 to 150,000 men out of there in a year's time and get the cost of the war down by a factor of 20 to 30 percent, even if we don't make serious diplomatic progress," he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 21, 1969]

GRANTS TO R. F. K. AIDES DEFENDED BY BUNDY (By A. D. Horne)

McGeorge Bundy, head of the world's largest foundation, spent four hours yesterday defending its activities against Congressmen who questioned its tax immunity and its political neutrality.

The Ford Foundation president, principal witness on the third day of the House Ways and Means Committee's tax reform hearings, denied that \$131,000 in travel grants presented to eight members of Sen. Robert Kennedy's staff after his assassination last June was "severance pay," as Rep. John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin, the Committee's senior Republican, put it.

Bundy said the grants were made on his own initiative in a spirit of "What can we do to help?" and "are fully justifiable in educational terms."

He conceded that the amounts (\$6,390 to \$22,000 for periods of from four to seven months) were larger than usual, but explained that most such grants are "salary supplements" for scholars on paid leave.

"The point" with the Kennedy staff grants, Bundy said, was that the eight men "had a special promise." Two of the eight have filed reports, he said, but whether the money was "well spent" could only be answered "several years from now."

He revealed that the Foundation had considered various forms of aid for associates of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. after his assassination last April, and instead had given \$8,000 to a group of Atlanta universities to start a historical archive on the work of the civil rights leader.

Bundy also confirmed that Ford had given a \$12,000, seven-week travel grant to one of President Johnson's top White House aides, Joseph A. Califano, and he revealed that another Johnson aide, Walt W. Rostow, was "discussing a summer study project" with the Foundation.

What was bothering Byrnes, Rep. George Bush (R-Tex.) and several other Committee members was the specter of the Foundation's \$3 billion assets being deployed in political activity. Despite Bundy's denials and assurances, the subject kept recurring:

A \$175,000 grant to Cleveland CORE in 1967, he said, was only marginally for voter registration activities that allegedly helped elect Carl Stokes the city's first Negro mayor. The grant was doubled in 1968, with Seth Taft, Stokes' 1967 rival, among its chief proponents, Bundy declared.

Members of Congress have been among public officials whose expenses to attend meetings have been paid by the Foundation. Rep. James A. Burke (D-Mass.) charged yesterday that officials "living high off the hog" on junkets could "influence voting." But Rep. Herman T. Schneebell (R-Pa.), another committee member, said he had been on a Ford-paid trip to Japan during the Easter recess last year and "I never worked so hard in my life."

Schneebell said he and seven other House members discussed Okinawa, China and trade problems with groups of Japanese legislators. Six House and eight Senate members have just returned from a similarly Ford-supported trip, he said.

Bundy, the former Harvard dean who served Presidents Kennedy and Johnson as chief foreign policy aide at the White House before taking charge of the Ford Foundation in March, 1966, was also kept busy fending off suggestions that foundations should share in the general tax burden.

"The question is, should some of us be paying taxes while others aren't," said Rep. Martha Griffiths (D-Mich.) in one sharp exchange. And Rep. Rogers C. B. Morton (R-Md.) said he was "very uncomfortable about capital accumulating in any institution that is in a tax-sheltered position. I think it's time to do something about that."

Bundy found little to praise in suggestions by Morton, Byrnes and Rep. Sam Gibbons (D-Fla.) that foundations such as Ford, financed by money that might otherwise have been subject to a 77 per cent inheritance tax, had to assume some tax obligation. Again and again Bundy pictured foundations as alternatives to an ever-growing Government and capable of attempting more innovative programs.

He also rejected a suggestion by Mrs. Griffiths that "the real purpose" for which the Ford Foundation was established was not charity but the Ford family's desire to neutralize 85 per cent of the firm's stock in the Foundation so they could control the company with the remaining 15 per cent.

Bundy told the Committee the Foundation had reduced its holdings of Ford stock (all nonvoting) to 27 or 28 per cent, mostly through sales back to the company. He said it would reduce this further to below 20 per cent by 1971. But he opposed a 1965 Treasury Department recommendation that 20 per cent be made a mandatory ceiling for a foundation's holdings in one company.

Over-all, his prescription for curbing abuses of the tax-exemption privilege lay in "accountability and disclosure." The current patchwork of state regulation is inadequate, he conceded. More information should be required of the foundations, and a Federal agency—possibly the Treasury—should "monitor their activities," he said.

[From American Opinion magazine, November 1968]

HOW THE FORD FOUNDATION FINANCES REVOLUTION

(By Harold Lord Varney)

(NOTE.—Harold Lord Varney is President and founder of the Committee on Pan American Policy, and Editor of Pan-American Headlines. He was formerly the Political Editor for American Mercury magazine, and was also advisor to the Republic of China between 1947 and 1948. Mr. Varney is an American Opinion Contributing Editor and Latin American correspondent.)

Not long before his great career was halted by serious illness, Henry Ford Sr. sat thinking about the future of his infant Ford Foundation. A life-long enemy of the *Insiders* and their Liberal Establishment, Mr. Ford was determined that his vast wealth should not fall into the hands of the Leftist camarilla which had subverted the foundations endowed by Carnegie and Rockefeller. Above all, he was adamant that the Ford fortune should not be used by the forces of the Left to help betray America.

But, how could he safeguard the Foundation after he was gone?

One possible solution occurred to him immediately. When President Franklin Roosevelt had viciously humiliated the heroic Charles A. Lindbergh for his support of the conservative America First movement, it was the Ford Motor Company which had found an important administrative post for him. Ford had long been a hearty admirer of the technical and administrative genius, patriotism, and moral soundness of Colonel Lindbergh. He decided to sound out the Colonel on the possibility of his accepting directorship of the Foundation, with full authority.

It is one of the tragedies of American his-

tory that Lindbergh did not immediately accept that offer; for, shortly thereafter, Henry Ford suffered a physical collapse. His heirs, alas, simply didn't understand the potential danger to their country which Leftist management of the vastly wealthy Ford Foundation might represent.

In its official annual statement, the Ford Foundation declares that its objective is "to identify and contribute to the solution of problems of national and international importance." Instead of pursuing this lofty course, the Foundation has been deliberately used to create new problems and exacerbate old ones. It has now made itself the champion of black racism. It has regularly waged war on anti-Communists. It has promoted and subsidized obscenity and pornography in American letters. It has encouraged and financed leaders of the race war which is filling American cities with murder, arson, and lawlessness. It has openly subsidized identified Communist revolutionaries. It has helped to debase American scholarship by exclusive support of research organizations and scholars promoting the propaganda of Marx, Keynes, Pavlov, and Freud as a replacement for classic philosophy in the American tradition.

In short, if we were to try to pinpoint the one organization which has in the last twenty years done most to move America away from traditional principles, the Ford Foundation would be that organization. In doing so, it has poured into Leftist channels the colossal sum of \$3.19 billion in grants and commitments.

I

To even begin to appreciate the tragedy of what has happened, one must begin with a brief look at the founding Ford.

It is today difficult to imagine the vast hold which Ford exercised upon the national imagination during the three decades between 1915 and the end of World War II. So great was his popularity that in the early Twenties the opinion polls indicated he could have been elected President in 1924 had he chosen to run. True, he made his share of mistakes—for example, the Peace Ship fiasco of 1915—but, for all that can be made of his bigger than life-size faults, few will deny that Henry Ford was the epitome of what we call the great American innovator. He was a religious, patriotic, prudent, frugal American genius who built an empire and shared it with the world. Americans loved him for it.

In the sharpest contrast to the pignies who are now spending his money, Henry Ford was a giant among the architects of progress. He was the father of American mass production—the innovation which made possible today's plenty. Even Lenin, in considering the adoption of mass production for Russia, recognized this fact and coined a Russian word for Fordization to describe it.

And, Ford was a capitalist in the best tradition. With his announcement in 1915 of an across-the-board minimum wage of five dollars a day (the equivalent of about \$25 a day in today's funny money) he ushered in the era of highly paid American labor. By innovating to increase the productivity of his workers, he could afford to pay a minimum of two hundred percent more than his competitors. Had Henry Ford done nothing but introduce the concept of assembly-line mass production, and pass the benefit on to his employees, that single contribution to American well-being would have dwarfed the total effect of every government Welfare scheme ever conceived.

Henry Ford scorned the Welfare philosophy so beloved of today's manipulators of his estate. It was he who explained that it was far better for capitalists to create jobs, thereby "helping others to help themselves." His answer to the advocates of government hand-outs was that "industry organized for service removes the need of philanthropy." He would have been aghast at the modern spectacle of 800,000 citizens in New York City gold-bricking on the relief rolls in a period

of full employment and massive opportunity. Contemporary proposals of a federally guaranteed annual income, detached from productive toil, would have nauseated him.

Nor would he have accepted programs aimed at promoting the Negro Revolution which the Ford Foundation's President McGeorge Bundy has made its central objective. Henry Ford spoke with authority about helping Negroes in the only way which makes sense. At a time when Northern factories and unions were virtually closed to Negro labor, the ultra-conservative Ford opened his giant plants at Highland Park and River Rouge to Negro workers on a basis of full equality with white labor. He believed that the Negro worker of equal ability was entitled to every opportunity enjoyed by the whites, and he did something about it. But, he would certainly have scorned with the most fierce sort of Baptist damnation the kind of hate which motivates the Black racist groups that Bundy is now using Henry Ford's money to underwrite for revolution.

That the fortune which Ford acquired through his enormous material and social contributions to the nation should now be expended to support and promote the sort of programs which he detested is the most bitter sort of commentary on our age. How did it happen?

II

The Ford Foundation, like many similar institutions, was conceived as a device to avoid confiscatory inheritance taxation. When the federal inheritance tax was first instituted by the Insiders in 1916, Ford saw its intent and began to make plans to establish the Foundation. By 1935, of course, Roosevelt's New Deal had expanded the federal inheritance tax to the point where it became both punitive and confiscatory—just as Karl Marx had proposed in the Communist Manifesto. Rates were upped to such a height that the heirs of a businessman of Ford's success faced a tax bite of ninety-one percent. In his case, this would have forced his family to sell control of the Ford Motor Company to pay the taxes.

The exposure of the family-owned firm to manipulation by the Eastern bankers was one thing which Henry Ford was determined to go to the most vigorous extremes to prevent. The Wall Street merger operators had long had greedy designs upon Ford's interests, and he was of no mind to bend to their will. In the early Twenties, when Henry Ford found himself in a serious financial pinch, the Eastern bankers had attempted to entrap him with an offer of finance. The shrewd Ford had spurned the baited trap and had astonished the business world with an unorthodox coup whereby he raised the capital he needed through his dealers. One of his most often-expressed concerns was that, after his death, the Establishment would wrest control from his heirs.

To prevent such a possibility, he instructed his lawyers to transfer eighty percent of his estate, and the estates of his family, to the Ford Foundation in the form of dividend-paying but nonvoting Class A stock. The remaining ownership, in Class B voting stock, would remain in the family, preserving control. This princely endowment of the Foundation was thus primarily a business gambit.

That Ford's untimely physical collapse prevented him from completing his preparations by selecting a directorate for the Foundation which would keep it out of the hands of the Left was the misfortune which opened the doors of the Ford Foundation to the very spoilers Henry Ford most despised. Ford's illness came in 1945. As one of his biographers delicately expressed it, the Ford heirs "arranged" his retirement. He died in 1947.

After 1945, the Ford affairs were in the hands of Mrs. Edsel Ford (Henry's daughter-in-law), Henry Ford II (his youthful grandson) and, to some extent, Ernest Kantzler, Mrs. Edsel Ford's brother-in-law, whom the elder Ford had fired. They were quickly surrounded with new company executives and

lawyers, none of whom shared Henry Ford's conservative convictions or his distrust of the Eastern Establishment. The Leftist mafia quickly moved in on the Ford money, grabbing for control of the Foundation.

When the dust settled, the chief administrator of the Ford Foundation was one Paul G. Hoffman, an *Insider* so important that he had been director of the propaganda arm of the notorious Council on Foreign Relations. A committee, including a doctor, a school administrator, and five professors—under the leadership of H. Rowan Gaither—had formulated the initial program of the Foundation to carry it into the netherworld of the Left, and Hoffman moved ahead with near total abandon. Armies of "intellectuals" on fat salaries were put to work drafting programs and guidelines.

The zaniest member of Hoffman's staff, and his chief assistant, was Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, who fairly bubbled with Marxist schemes and declarations so far to the Left that they would have made Gus Hall choke with embarrassment. From 1951, Hutchins was Hoffman's Associate Director at \$50,000 a year.

In 1953, a palace revolution of "out" professors won the support of Henry Ford II, and Hoffman and Hutchins were soon replaced. But, unfortunately, they were not detached from the Foundation. They were, in fact, given an outright grant of \$15 million for something called a "Fund for the Republic"—to spend as they saw fit.

The causes for which these Leftists spent the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic are believable today only in the context of the backwash they created against "McCarthyism." \$100,000 was poured down the drain on a study of federal loyalty-security programs, conducted by Walter Millis, a literary hack who was well-known as an enemy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. \$300,000 was spent on a study of the "influence of Communism in contemporary America"—with Communist Earl Browder, long-time National Secretary of the Communist Party, as a key member of the staff. \$100,000 was authorized for a study of "blacklisting" on radio and television, to discredit efforts of patriotic organizations trying to keep Communists from propagandizing over America's airwaves. \$150,000 was spent on a survey to create propaganda that high school and college teachers were being intimidated by patriotic groups.

An undisclosed amount of Ford money was also spent by the Fund to finance the distribution to schools and community groups of Edward R. Murrow's ghastly propaganda broadside defending J. Robert Oppenheimer, whose security clearance had been lifted after his own admission that he had contributed money to the Communist Party, and then lied about it. \$200,000 was offered, and then withdrawn under pressure, to create a television program for Herb Block, the viciously Leftist "cartoonist" of the *Washington Post*. And, at a time when the American Friends Service Committee was devoting itself to a whitewash of Mao Tse-tung's Communist revolution in China, and urging the recognition of Red China, the Ford Foundation (at Hoffman's insistence) presented the Friends Committee with \$1,134,000. Ford's Paul Hoffman, of course, had been a trustee of the Communist Institute of Pacific Relations which had been largely responsible for Mao's success.

Space does not permit the listing of all the Hutchins-Hoffman efforts. Suffice it to say that they exhausted that \$15 million and then some.

With the Fund depleted, Hoffman married Mrs. Anna Rosenberg and went on to a key post at the United Nations—where he turned over millions in U.S. funds to Castro, approved the spending of American dollars to create a nuclear project behind the Iron Curtain, and otherwise supported Communist interests. Hutchins meanwhile reorganized the Fund for the Republic into a

wildly Leftist monster called the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and financed it through some highly curious "private donations and foundation grants." A sample of its heavy-handed anti-Americanism is its recent staging of the *Pacem in Terra* Conferences in Europe, to create propaganda against American boys fighting and dying in Vietnam. Whether the Ford Foundation still continues to contribute to the ventures of Hutchins' radical Center has remained a carefully guarded secret.

III

Meanwhile, back at the main Ford Foundation establishment, the Division for the Behavioral Sciences was stirring up a rumpus of its own by invading the privacy of jury chambers to obtain evidence with which to blast the American court system. An authorization of \$1 million was given to finance the bugging of jury rooms to overhear the talk of jurors. The project, conducted by Professor Henry Kalvin Jr. and Dean E. H. Levi of the University of Chicago Law School, aroused a storm of public indignation when it was exposed by the State Judiciary Committee. It is not surprising that the fatly funded Dean is on record as an outspoken enemy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and Professor Kalvin was working with the Comrades to secure clemency for the Communists' Rosenberg atom spies.

Obviously, the exit of Hoffman and his subversive companions were merely a public relations gambit designed to deceive an outraged public.

An ideal successor for Paul Hoffman was found, after a brief interregnum, in the person of Henry T. Heald. A smiler with a knife where Hoffman was a rampaging mammoth, Heald centered the attention of his nine years in the Foundation upon manipulating American universities. Effectively scattering Ford money among key universities and colleges, he succeeded in bringing the academic establishment into the Ford Foundation net. In one staggering gesture, Heald announced the distribution of over \$500 million to a select list of academic institutions. Leftist Ferdinand Lundberg recently explained how such grants are used to set educational policy:

"By making serial gifts each year out of income from a perpetual principal fund, the donor can keep prospective worthy recipients sitting around forever, like a circle of hungry dogs, awaiting the next handout. In such an arrangement, prospective institutional recipients are not likely to voice unwelcome... ideas."

The corrupting effect of these Ford handouts was recently brought home to this author in the case of a small denominational college in the Midwest which I once attended. The college has a background of fundamentalist Christianity which was hardly reassuring to the "new era" manipulators who dispense Ford money. When it applied for a Ford donation under the Heald regime, it was turned down.

Badly needing funds, the college executives quickly got the point. When Ford Foundation President McGeorge Bundy announced that the fight for Negro "rights" had now become the Ford Foundation's chief concern, they proceeded to streamline the college to impress Bundy and his associates that they were doing something about Lo, the Poor Negro. They even invited Dick Gregory, fresh from jail, to lecture at the college. When Commencement Day approached, they selected Harry Belafonte as the Commencement Day speaker and recipient of an honorary doctorate.

These college administrators have not yet received their Ford Foundation payoff, but it won't be long. One remembers, for example, how quickly the Ford Foundation came to the aid of another college in the Midwest when it moved back the compulsory retirement age to displace the great conservative professor E. Merrill Root.

Of course, Heald continued to keep the Foundation active in such schemes as granting half a million dollars for use by Communist professors in Poland, and providing fellowships for Communists in Italy and for such well-known Reds as the notorious Clinton Jencks. But, as the Heald Administration drew toward its close, forces in the Ford Foundation were restless to assume an even more activist role. The emergence of the New Left, and the encouragement and idolization being provided to the Negro Revolution by the Johnson Administration, suggested to Foundation strategists that Ford should also get into the act. With the federal poverty agencies cutting into its territory by making vast grants to favored organizations and individuals, the Ford group decided that it would simply have to run faster to keep up with the parade. What the Foundation needed was a more vigorously activist president. It found him, in 1966, in the person of McGeorge Bundy.

Since the Ford Foundation is today largely a reflection of the activism of President Bundy, let us look at some of the things that make him tick.

At first glance, McGeorge Bundy would seem to be an appropriate choice for President of the Ford Foundation. He entered public life under President Kennedy with most Americans unaware of the aroma of radicalism about him. He was a member of a distinguished Republican Brahmin family. He was Yale, with all it implies. His first position, after graduation, was on the staff of the Council on Foreign Relations, the nerve center of the Eastern Establishment. A prodigy, like Hutchins, he was Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard at the age of thirty-four. From this eminence, he had leapt to Washington and, under Kennedy and Johnson, became the premier figure in the National Security Council. By 1966, when he came to Ford, Bundy carried with him from Washington the aura of a young man of destiny.

But, under the mannered front, and beneath his disciplined dedication to the Far Left, McGeorge Bundy was mostly mush. He swallowed, open mouthed, every fable the professional anti-anti-Communists hand out about the Right. He believed with certainty that collectivism was the wave of the future, and that an ambitious young man should grab a surfboard and ride the crest. Above all, he was an incredibly bad judge of men, as evidenced by the fact that it was he who chose to play host to the "anti-Communist" Fidel Castro at Harvard in 1959.

Still, only once in his career as a White House advisor was he so incautious as to be maneuvered into a position where his subversion could be publicly identified. The results were, however, most distressing. At the height of the Dominican crisis of 1964, when President Johnson was floundering around under the advice of such light-weights as Ambassador John Bartlow Martin and Comrades Pepe Figueres and Romulo Betancourt, Bundy allowed himself to be selected as the man to go to the Dominican Republic to find a solution. He was appointed Presidential Envoy with authority to name a provisional Dominican President. Bundy arrived importantly, with an impressive entourage. "He works fast," one of his public-relations people gurgled to the Santo Domingo Press.

He worked too fast. In the face of the fact that the revolution had been fomented by former President Juan Bosch, a Communist, and that our troops had been landed on the island ostensibly to see that the Dominican Republic did not fall into Communist hands, Bundy chose one of Bosch's own men to be President. He was Antonio Guzman, Minister of Agriculture in the deposed Bosch Administration. Bundy reassured everyone that Guzman was not a Communist, despite the fact that Antonio had only a few weeks

before conferred with the Americans as an official representative of Comrade Bosch.

But, there was worse to follow. Thanks to the enterprising research of Washington newsman John T. O'Rourke, it was quickly disclosed that Guzman was even then under investigation for a \$75 million theft from the Banco Agricola, which Guzman had headed under Bosch. As Congress stormed, Antonio Guzman was dropped with an amazing suddenness, and Bundy made an unhappy return to Washington. The measure of McGeorge Bundy's sagacity, of course, was the fact that he was willing to establish Comrade Guzman as President of the Dominican Republic without even a check of his record.

The heat was on.

Just as Alger Hiss had under similar circumstances been spirited out of the State Department and named President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Bundy was as suddenly named President of the Ford Foundation.

McGeorge Bundy ran true to form. With Communists working among Negroes in every American city, he immediately announced that meeting the interests of the Negro Revolution would now be "the first of the nation's problems" with which the Ford Foundation would deal. Leading the Foundation into the complicated field of Negro agitation and persona, he has poured out Ford money to the whole spectrum of professional Negro agitators. It is not an overstatement to say that, under Bundy, almost any plausible black leader with a plan to encourage Negro intransigence can walk into the offices of the Ford Foundation and come out with a generous check in five or six figures.

Typical of these schemes—and conspicuous because Bundy gave his name to the project—was his use of the Ford Foundation to back "school decentralization" in New York City along lines proposed by black racists. Cooperating with Mayor Lindsay, who sees a rich harvest of Negro votes in the promotion of turmoil between the schools and the neighborhoods, he manufactured what is called the "Bundy Report," calling for virtual abolition of the administration of schools by the City Board of Education. In place of the city-wide Board, Bundy proposed that authority be placed in the hands of thirty to sixty district boards, made up of representatives chosen by racially oriented neighborhood organizations, teacher representatives, and politicians appointed by Mayor Lindsay. Such district boards, composed largely of radicals and politicians, would have the last word on matters of curriculum, school activities, and school administration.

In short, education was to be taken out of the hands of qualified teachers and school administrators and placed at the mercy of neighborhood revolutionaries and hacks belonging to the Mayor's political machine. Bundy soon found himself entangled in a bitter contest with the teachers' union, and (worse for his "Liberal" credentials) condemned by the Board of Rabbis and by the Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service, speaking for 26,000 Jewish teachers. Dark rumors spread that McGeorge Bundy was supporting black anti-Semitism and revolutionary racism.

When a bill was introduced in the New York Legislature authorizing the phony decentralization which Bundy had proposed, it met with a cold reception. So, Mr. Bundy decided that he would force the plan through the Legislature by proving its worth—spending a few barrels of cash from the Ford gusher on three "demonstration" projects in New York City—one in Harlem, one in Ocean Hill-Brownsville, and one on the East Side.

The Harlem venture, centered on Intermediate School 201, came to grief first. A "parents' organization," quickly infiltrated by subversives and the worst racist troublemakers

in Harlem, demanded control of the school. When the non-Negro principal attempted to preserve order he was barred from the building by screaming agitators from all parts of New York City. The subversives then brazenly took over the school and presented in its auditorium a filthy, anti-white play by LeRoi Jones, the professional scatologist. Soon, black terrorist Herman B. Ferguson was brought to the school to speak at a viciously anti-white meeting in honor of Communist Malcolm X. Ferguson, a member of R.A.M., the Communists' secret terrorist organization for Negroes, had earlier been arrested and indicted in Queens on a charge of plotting the assassination of non-Communist Negro leaders and of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Comrade Ferguson delivered the address while out on bail, awaiting trial.

When Herman Ferguson was rearrested for violation of the terms of his bail, it was revealed that after his initial arrest the Ford Foundation had employed him on one of its projects, and that the terrorist was in fact on the payroll of the Ford Foundation at the time he addressed that meeting of the followers of Communist Malcolm X.

Bundy's demonstration district in Ocean Hill-Brownsville similarly erupted into racial violence. The district superintendent there, a Negro, summarily fired nineteen white teachers and supervisors at the demand of his predominantly Negro "Community Council." This resulted in a strike by the teachers, countered by the setting up of riotous picket lines by Negro revolutionaries. The schools had to be closed down, and pupils deprived of education, while the factions battled. To create this shambles, McGeorge Bundy had paid out \$77,000 from the tax-exempt coffers of the Ford Foundation.

But Bundy was soon to get caught at even further Marxist machinations in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville affair when it was disclosed that the moving force behind the Negro rioting there was the nine-times-arrested "Reverend" Milton A. Galamison. For years, Galamison has been fomenting and leading street disorders in Queens and Brooklyn. His ideological commitment is indicated by the fact that he was the keynote speaker at the organizing convention of the Communist W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, set up at the call of Gus Hall, the National Secretary of the Communist Party. The point is that in 1967 Bundy had authorized a Ford Foundation grant of \$160,000 to underwrite Comrade Galamison's revolutionary work.

Although Bundy had the support of such Leftists as Mayor John Lindsay, U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe, and State Commissioner James E. Allen, the New York State Legislature tried to kill his program. The teachers' union spearheaded the fight in Albany against Bundy's program and made its case most convincingly. After a bitter debate, the Legislature passed a considerably weakened bill—though it still gave Mayor Lindsay the authority to appoint additional members to the Board of Education, and directed the Board to bring in a report on "decentralization" sometime in 1969.

Nonetheless, Bundy and his black racists wanted things completely their way—or else. They demanded that Governor Nelson Rockefeller veto the weakened bill. Curiously, the fight for a veto was led by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, a Negro leader who has in the past avoided racial extremism. Dr. Clark's action became more understandable when it was learned that in 1967 Bundy had sent a \$700,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to support the Metropolitan Applied Research Center which Clark heads.

Governor Rockefeller, realizing the angry mood of the electorate, declined to veto the law. The full revolutionary commitment of the Bundy-Lindsay strategy was then revealed. Mayor Lindsay announced the names of his appointees to the enlarged City Board of Education: The name of revolutionary

Milton A. Galamison led all the rest. Lindsay, with Bundy's advice, saw nothing improper in appointing this co-founder of the Communist W.E.B. DuBois Clubs—organized to recruit youth for the Communists—to sit in supreme command over the education of the 3 million students in the New York public schools. As I write, teachers in the New York public schools have been out on a protest strike over these matters for three weeks. Of course, people like Lindsay and Bundy don't need to worry. Their children are snug in fancy private schools.

Although he suffered a partial setback in this fight in New York City, Bundy's benefactions and subsidies from the Ford Foundation to black racists are expanding in a golden stream. He sent the "moderate" N.A.A.C.P. some \$300,000, with \$1 million more for its Legal Defense Fund. The "moderate" National Urban League, whose chief (Whitney M. Young) has come out against non-violence and in favor of Black Power, received \$430,000—now swollen by \$1,415,990 for "fair housing" programs and \$155,000 for "New Careers Week" programs. McGeorge Bundy also placed Martin Luther King's Communist-staffed Southern Christian Leadership Conference down for a fat \$230,000—the first Ford grant to King in ten years of hate-filled agitation. And, of course, the National Council of Negro Women received another \$300,000.

McGeorge Bundy has, of course, given Ford Foundation funds to the black "wild men" with even greater abandon. Floyd B. McKissick, Stokely Carmichael's ally in the Black Power movement, obtained \$175,000 for the viciously anti-white programs of C.O.R.E. In 1968 the Ford Foundation disbursed \$300,000 more to C.O.R.E. to be expended in Cleveland—apparently to bolster the Administration of Negro Mayor Carl B. Stokes. A brazen admission that the Ford Foundation, despite its tax-exempt status, had chosen to participate openly in Cleveland politics was provided in the Ford specification that the money it gave C.O.R.E. is to be used "for voter education and registration." The kind of "education" that the militant revolutionaries of C.O.R.E. will give to the Cleveland voters can be imagined. In the recent Cleveland riots, for example, it was revealed that Ahmed (Fred) Evans, who shot and killed Cleveland policemen from ambush, had received a grant of \$10,000 from the Ford-supported Mayor Stokes' O.E.O. coffers.

Le Roi Jones, whose claim to literary distinction is based on his authorship of such vulgar anti-white diatribes as *The Toilet*—in which the whole action takes place in a privy—was encouraged to go on with such pornography by a Ford Foundation grant of \$50,000 to stage racist plays. Later, Jones was arrested in Newark while helping to lead the 1967 riots there. He was heavily armed and mouthing murderous threats.

The A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund, which is the sounding board for Bayard Rustin, had received \$45,000 from the Ford Foundation. In 1968, Bundy increased this amount with a second grant of \$176,000. This is the organization which is demanding that the U.S. Government contribute \$125 billion to the Negro Revolution as an indemnity for slavery. The Ford Foundation's repeated support of the Randolph Fund can only mean that Bundy approves its incredible proposal. Otherwise, the Foundation would certainly have made discontinuance of such agitation a condition for approval of the second grant.

Before attaching himself to the aging Randolph, incidentally, Bayard Rustin had worked for both C.O.R.E. and Martin Luther King. A former member of the Young Communist League, the Ford-subsidized Bayard has an unsavory record including twenty-eight months imprisonment for draft resistance in World War II and a sentence of sixty days imprisonment in 1952 as a sex pervert.

Not only has Bundy used the Ford Foundation to reward Negro hate groups, terrorists, pornographers, and convicted perverts, but he has made generous donations to white organizations which are supporting racial excesses. Among these are \$100,000 to support Leftist programs for the National League of Women Voters, \$108,000 to support the racial agitation of the National Council of Churches, \$35,000 for the anti-anti-Communism of the Anti-Defamation League, \$522,000 to the radical National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, \$100,000 to the American Jewish Congress, \$200,000 to the American Council for Nationalities Service, \$100,000 to the pro-Vietcong American Friends Service Committee, \$162,000 to the Far Left's National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, and \$658,000 for the Red-staffed Southern Regional Council. To further sharpen racial antagonisms in the South, a Ford grant of \$600,000 was given to the vicious Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under the Law.

It is extremely disquieting to contemplate the grim phalanx of professional racists which these grants have created—all with a nested interest in perpetuating Negro disturbances in our cities. It is little wonder that the Communist *National Guardian* cheered on January 13, 1968: "The [Ford] Foundation plays a key part in financing and influencing all major civil rights groups. . . ."

Still, were Bundy's Ford Foundation benefactions confined to organizations supporting black racism, excuses might be made for him on the ground that he is simply off-center on the matter of race. But, his spending indicates that he is equally anxious to use Ford funds to promote discontent and defiance among non-Negro groups. Note, for example, his support of Walter Reuther's Marxist "Citizens Crusade Against Poverty." This organization is an undisguised attempt to organize Welfare and O.E.O. "clients" into an insurgent voting bloc which could be employed by Reuther for his own devious political purposes. It is designed to be a pressure bloc for Reuther and his comrades to use in their dealings with politicians. And Walter Reuther, one recalls, is the chap who sent home a letter during one of his training sessions in the Soviet Union, signed: "Yours for a Soviet America."

Until the advent of Bundy, the "Crusade" had little luck in extracting money from the Ford Foundation, even though Walter Reuther appointed as its Executive Director one Richard W. Boone, a former Ford Foundation executive. But, among McGeorge Bundy's first acts in 1966 was an allocation of \$508,500 for the Crusade. This, it is understood, is only a starter.

Bundy, of course, would not be true to his past as an analyst for the dangerous Council on Foreign Relations if he did not also put Ford money into internationalist propaganda. Some of the wildly Leftist organizations in this field which have received his Ford handouts are the Council on Foreign Relations (\$1 million), the Adlai E. Stevenson Institute of International Affairs (\$1 million), U.N.E.S.C.O. (\$200,000), the United Nations Association (\$150,000), the Institute for International Education (\$1,625,000), the American Assembly (\$166,000), World Affairs Council (\$102,000), Congress for Cultural Freedom (\$1,500,000); C.E.D., Foreign Policy Research (\$275,000); and, the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations (\$250,000).

Late in July of 1968, with the radical National Student Association neck deep in promoting revolutionary activities on the nation's campuses, Bundy provided N.S.A. with a Ford grant of \$315,000 to "finance the increasing power of college students in educational reform." He added an extra \$7,260 to support a special "Black Commission" for N.S.A. And, with the Communists promoting revolution among Mexican-Americans, Bundy also sent a Ford grant in July, amounting to

\$630,000, to the revolutionary Southwest Council of La Raza—headed by identified Communist Maclovio R. Barraza—for agitation among Mexican-Americans.

But, for sheer gall, Bundy's use of Ford Foundation funds to invade the field of American television tops everything. It is the most cynical program to promote Marxist interests that the Ford Foundation has yet attempted. And, it is the most massive.

When he took over the helm of the Foundation, McGeorge Bundy engaged Fred W. Friendly as Ford's Consultant in Television. Friendly will be remembered as the man who stood at the side of Edward R. Murrow in 1953 and 1954 in the venomous character assassination of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. When C.B.S. dropped Friendly's contract, Bundy hastened to hire him.

The agency which the Foundation selected for its manipulation of TV programming is the National Educational Television and Radio Center (N.E.T.). Last year, the Ford Foundation poured \$6 million into N.E.T. to support a Leftist network of 125 non-commercial cooperating stations. (Its New York outlet is Channel Thirteen, the *New York Times* station.) The Foundation also gave another \$7.9 million to the equally Leftist Public Broadcast Laboratory.

N.E.T. now specializes in putting on the air programs of such bad odor that even the "Liberal" commercial networks wouldn't dare touch them. One of these was Felix Greene's monstrous film, *"North Vietnam, A Personal Report."* Greene is a wild British Marxist who is so open about his love of the Comrades that he has even authored a book in praise of Mao Tse-tung. Felix has made a career as a producer of films extolling Red China and Castro's Cuba. Regularly visiting Communist-ruled countries, he is given royal treatment and provided with every facility for making his propaganda pictures. When it was announced that he would exhibit his pro-Vietcong program on N.E.T., thirty-three Members of Congress protested it as an outrage to American soldiers dying in Vietnam. The Ford-funded N.E.T., of course, disregarded their protest and exhibited this Communist propaganda film anyway.

Another touted N.E.T. feature was *"Nine-ty Days,"* a motion picture purporting to be an objective study of South Africa. After N.E.T. had shown and praised the thing, it was revealed that the film had been produced, and even performed in, by a woman who was a former Secretary of the Communist Party of South Africa, and who had later been deported from Kenya for Communist activity.

Among the favorite subjects of the Ford-funded N.E.T. is kindly Fidel Castro. Two pro-Castro propaganda films have been shown by N.E.T. in successive years. The first was *Report on Cuba*, made by Saul Landau—an activist for the Communist Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The second was *"Three Faces of Cuba,"* an equally phony rhapsody of Castro's "great achievements" in happy Communist Cuba.

For the long-run, however, perhaps the most disquieting feature of the Ford invasion of television is its project to place a communications satellite in space to transmit TV signals for the N.E.T. propaganda network. It is estimated that this will halve the cost of N.E.T. programs. Since the Ford Foundation enjoys tax exemption, and its competitors in the commercial networks must pay taxes, it seems a brazen thing for Bundy to be permitted to use tax-free funds to set up a competing network with halved costs. But, the mind of this man is so overlaid with revolutionary zeal that the thought has no doubt never occurred to him. Let us hope that it soon occurs to Congress.

xv

The story of the Ford Foundation and its revolutionary efforts, of course, leads to the

wider question of the place of the foundation in our American system.

Can we permit such enormous centers of wealth to continue to receive tax-exempt status as they move to control American politics and remake our whole social fabric in the most radical patterns? Can we survive as a free nation if American public opinion is to be shaped and controlled by quasi-governmental organizations, backed by vast tax-free fortunes, and serving the interests of any radical ideology?

The fact is that the largest of these foundations, the Ford Foundation, is only one of 100,000 such institutions now seeking to manipulate us all with untaxed wealth. The 595 largest foundations, which were scrutinized recently by the House Select Committee on Small Business, control tax-exempt assets of over \$15 billion. This colossal sum has been detached from the otherwise controlled national economy and, in most cases, turned over to an irresponsible rabble of Leftist and Establishment professors and ex-professors who have maneuvered control out of the indifferent hands of its capitalist donors. This foundation bureaucracy is now pouring out vast sums to remake American society in its own Leftist image. And, there is little hope that such foundations will alter their ways, unless compelled to do so by the demand of an outraged American people.

In the case of the Ford Foundation, although three members of the Ford family sit on the Board of Trustees, there has never been any public indication that they are dissatisfied with the off-beat policies of the radical McGeorge Bundy and his administrators. Certainly none of the Ford grandsons publicly share the social concern of the founding Ford. Nor is the fifteen-member Board of Trustees likely to curb Bundy's revolutionary madness. The Board is a carefully picked collection of corporate bureaucrats and former appointees of the Roosevelt, Kennedy, or Johnson Administrations. Their slant on foreign policy is indicated by the fact that eight of the fifteen are also members of the Insiders club of radical internationalists, the Council on Foreign Relations.

With such names as J. Irwin Miller (President of the National Council of Churches), and John Cowles (Publisher of Look), dotting the list, it is obvious that a repudiation of Bundy by Trustee action is most unlikely.

One thing, and one thing alone, could curb the present arrogance of these great foundations. That would be a change in the moral and intellectual climate of America. The radicalism of a Bundy-led Ford Foundation could not survive two weeks if it were not fed by the ignorance of an uninformed public, and by the encouragement of a Washington overrun with collectivists. There are convincing indications that this change of climate is coming. Bundy and his comrades at the Ford Foundation can be counted upon to do everything in their power to halt it.

But, frankly, I don't think they'll succeed. Certainly, if a Congressional committee starts to take a hard look at the Ford Foundation, Mr. Bundy and his crew will be finished in short order. What about it, Senators McClellan, Mundt, and Williams? What about it, Congressmen Mills, Patman, and Broyhill? Will you act, now?

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM OVERDUE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, congressional reform is long overdue. The Congress has failed to take

any action to overhaul its rules and procedures since 1946. We are still using procedures adopted over 20 years ago to make decisions about an annual budget of nearly \$200 billion. While the executive branch has been quick to adopt the latest developments in computer technology, the Congress still attempts to get by without automatic data processing equipment.

Failure to implement truly effective reforms will seriously impair our ability to deal with the complex problems of the 1970's, and confirm those critics of our present system who argue for the destruction of our democratic institutions. Certainly the American people deserve more than our past record of inaction.

H.R. 6278 now before the Rules Committee provides the necessary machinery for Congress to regain the ground lost in previous years to the executive branch. The measure has received widespread support in the news media, and I include an excellent editorial from the Appleton (Wis.) Post-Crescent of February 18, at this point as a reminder to my colleagues of the need for action:

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM OVERDUE

Senior Congressmen like the idea of congressional reform, as one Washington columnist sees it, about the same way Winnie the Pooh likes sour honey.

As a result, there has been no major overhaul of Congressional rules and procedures since 1946. As the country has churned ahead at a furious pace over the last generation, Congress has continued to mind its store in the same old way.

Perhaps the best example of failure to get with the times is in the way Congress handles money matters. It has become a tradition in the last few years that appropriation bills for the coming year are never passed by July 1 when the new fiscal year begins. Often months go by until the agencies know what their new budgets will be.

And, incredibly, Congress, which oversees a federal budget of nearly \$200 billion, still manages to get along without automatic data processing.

The executive branch has long since moved into sophisticated budget techniques, including new methods of evaluating not only the dollar costs of programs, but also for making judgments on their effectiveness in terms of performance. Congress makes no parallel judgments, even though it has the responsibility for oversight of all federal programs.

A group of young Republican congressmen, including William Steiger of Oshkosh, have chafed at this sad budget situation and at many other outmoded congressional procedures.

So they introduced a modest package of proposals two years ago calling for some improvements in the system. Because the recommendations had originated for the most part with a bipartisan joint congressional committee, there were no major attacks on the seniority system. Most of the provisions merely accomplish elements of house-cleaning that are long overdue.

Among the key proposals:

Requirements for open committee meetings.

Public disclosure of crucial committee votes.

Tighter restrictions on lobbying and more reliable reporting procedures.

Use of automatic data processing by the General Accounting Office and the Legislative Reference Service, both vital tools for Congress in its overseer role.

Mandatory roll call votes on all appropriation bills.

Increased staffing rights for the minority members of committees so that constructive

alternative proposals can be developed effectively.

Public notice of committee hearings and provisions for live broadcasting and telecasting.

Establishment of a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, to continually upgrade Congressional activities.

The history of this bill is not surprising. After passing the Senate early in the 90th Congress by a margin of 75-9, it was referred to the House Rules Committee.

There it languished for 19 months while the Republicans and several Democrats pleaded with the House Democratic leadership to allow the bill to come to the floor under an open rule so the majority could work its will.

The Republicans tried to dramatize the committee stranglehold by using parliamentary delaying techniques during a continuous "long day" that lasted more than 32 hours over Oct. 8 and 9. Only by locking the doors of the chamber did Speaker McCormack put down the Republican "raiders."

The Congressional Reform bill then died a quiet death in the Rules Committee.

This year, the Republicans are picking up where they left off. They are reintroducing the legislative reorganization act in the hopes that enough bipartisan support can be found to pressure the House leadership to allow a bill to reach the floor.

The Republicans have a legitimate right to raise a ruckus about the need to bring the Congress into the 20th Century. And if the senior Democrats don't realize it soon, the GOP is going to have a ready-made campaign issue for the off-year congressional elections in two years.

And that could be more distasteful than sour honey.

SENTINEL SYSTEM CONTROL VERSIAL

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following news items:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

LAIRD SEEN WILLING TO DROP THICK ABM

... The ABM Laird apparently favors is a "reconfigured" version of the Sentinel system, which had been designed to protect about 15 U.S. cities from threat of a Chinese missile assault.

Laird is said to be leaning toward moving the Sentinel into the countryside to provide protection for offensive missile sites.

Washington Post, February 16, 1969:

Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor proposed to his superiors in the Defense Department last fall a massive public relations campaign to counteract scientific and political opposition to the controversial Sentinel system for destroying enemy missiles.

The Resor proposals, outlined in a classified five-page memorandum to then Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford, were a follow-up to a major pro-Sentinel campaign launched in March 1968...

... The memorandum was accompanied by a much more detailed, 17-page "master plan" for a "public relations/public affairs program on a country-wide basis."

And this longer memorandum (was) signed by Lt. Gen. Alfred D. Starbird who manages the Sentinel project.

We take you now to the Five Sides Advertising Agency where marketing expert Dr. Strangebird is speaking with the chief:

We're having a little trouble with that new account for Missiles Unlimited, Chief.

Strangebird, if I've told you once, I've told you a billion times the advertising game goes a lot easier if the product will work. Who signed up that account anyway?

I'm not sure, Chief, but I think it was somebody else.

Well, how are we going to handle it?

Well, I thought we might see if Mad Magazine will change its policy just this once and accept a series of ads on the mongoose Missile.

O.K., but what would the ad say? It should have a lot of thrust.

Right! Well, since we were a little late getting off the ground with this one, those inferior scientists who don't work for us are convincing people not to buy—just because the product won't work. The old "Don't-leave-your-family-defenseless" bit just isn't going to work. We'll have to go for some other mass motivational factor—say the profit motive.

But we'll have to make a transition—bearing in mind that it doesn't make any difference what the Mongoose is used for so long as our clients sell it.

I think a series of three Fool Page Ads beginning April first should do it:

[Advertisement No. 1]

"Are you a thinking American?"

"Would you believe you'd be leaving your family defenseless if you don't let us install a brand new Mongoose Missile in your home town?"

[Advertisement No. 2]

"Are you a thinking American?"

"Would you believe you'd be leaving your family defenseless if you don't let us install the '69 Mongoose somewhere else instead of your home town—say out in the country?"

[Advertisement No. 3]

"Are you a thinking American?"

"Would you believe you'd look ten billion dollars thinner if you help send a poor Defenseless Contractor to camp at the door of the Treasury?"

"Is this any way to run the national debt sky high? You bet it is."

What do you think, Chief? If you want to pretend like it's patriotic, we could take the old "my contractor, right or wrong" and run it up the flag pole to see if we can call somebody un-American for not saluting it.

No, Strangebird, I think you've hit it. Call up the account and tell them to relax. We'll stick with them through thick and thin.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN HEW

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper article in the Washington Post described the efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to recruit qualified women for high positions in that Department. In and of itself, this is a very commendable effort, and I have no doubt that the Department will be able to recruit a great many able women to help it in its important tasks.

According to the newspaper article, the Department originally sent forth inquiries to highly respected women's organizations asking for women "between the ages of 25 and 35." Now, however, realizing that it is "unrealistic" to expect to be able to meet their needs in this very narrow age bracket, the Department has raised its age barrier from 35 to 50. This

is, Mr. Speaker, a step forward, but it is a step which falls 15 years short of the standard which the Congress set for private employers. It is a step in the right direction, but it seems to me that we should not allow a Federal agency to take any steps short of full compliance with the spirit and the letter of the law.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 forbids as unlawful the imposition of age discrimination in employment below the age of 65. President Johnson's Executive Order 11141, and President Kennedy's March 1963 memorandum to all Department heads made it perfectly clear that age discrimination is not allowable in Federal employment. Since the Congress has decided that private employers cannot discriminate against workers on the grounds of age, at any point before their 65th year, I think it is obvious that the intent and the thrust of our stated public policy is that Government may not fall short of this mark.

I have written to Secretary Finch, setting forth these facts, and expressing my confidence that he will change this impermissible practice forthwith. I insert the following at this point in the Record, the Washington Post news story setting forth the facts, my letter to Secretary Finch, and the texts of Executive Order 11141 and President Kennedy's Memorandum of March 14, 1963:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 27, 1969]

OLDER WOMEN: AN OPEN DOOR

(By Marie Smith)

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has decided not to close the door on women over the age of 35 as potential appointees for high level jobs in the Department.

Word went out from the Department yesterday that women up to 50 years of age would be considered for possible appointments.

The original request, made last week to the American Association of University Women's national headquarters here, was for women "between 25 and 35" and "preferably Republicans."

Jean Hawkins, an assistant to Patricia Hitt, Assistant Secretary of HEW, explained the raise in the age limit this way:

"When we got to thinking about it, we decided we weren't being realistic. A lot of women, like Mrs. Hitt and myself, didn't really get started in a career until their children were grown. And too many at the younger ages are too busy to take jobs."

She added that the 50-year-age limit is not rigid. "If we got a tremendous resume of someone 51 or so, it would not be a detriment to them," she said. Mrs. Hitt is 51. Mrs. Hawkins said she was "under 50" but didn't give details.

Mrs. Hawkins said that so far she has asked only the AAUW for names of women to add to her talent roster, but she will make the same request to other national women's groups, including the National Federation of Business and Professional Women.

During last year's presidential campaign, Mrs. Hawkins served as executive secretary to Mrs. Hitt, who was co-chairman of the Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee.

Meanwhile, two Republican women, one 49 and the other over 60, are being considered for the director of the Office of Territories at the Department of Interior, a post which carries a GS17 rating and is presently filled by Ruth Van Cleve, a career employee.

They are Elizabeth Farrington, over 60 and a former Congressional delegate from

Hawaii, and Louise Bundy, 49, of Albuquerque, N.M.

Mrs. Farrington, who succeeded her late husband, Joseph R. Farrington, in the 83d Congress was the first woman to represent Hawaii when it was a territory, in Congress. She is also a past president of the National Federation of Republican Women and was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1917.

Mrs. Bundy, the mother of six children ages 7 to 18, and the wife of a professor of television and speech at the University of New Mexico, is presently working on Capitol Hill in the office of Rep. Manuel Lujan (R-N.M.).

Mrs. Van Cleve, the present director of the Office, is expected to be given another post in the Department. She has worked in the Interior Department since 1950 and was promoted to director of the office in 1964 in former President Johnson's campaign to put 50 women in top level Government jobs.

Meanwhile, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew has added a woman to his professional staff. She is Jean Nieman, who will be working with the Youth Opportunities Program to be spearheaded by the Vice President.

Miss Nieman said yesterday the program will be announced in about a month.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to a recent newspaper story, of which a copy is enclosed, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which has been searching for women, between the ages of 25 and 35, for appointive office, has now raised the upper age barrier to 50.

I could not fault the Department for raising its cut-off age from 35 to 50, were it not for the fact that age discrimination at any point below age 65 is directly contrary to the formal public policy of the United States, as enunciated by both the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government.

Public Law 90-202 prohibits, as unlawful, arbitrary age discrimination in private employment. That Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, does not, I realize, include the United States as an "employer" subject to its coverage, but were it the only statement of public policy on the issue, it would still be shocking to find an agency of this Government practicing a kind of discrimination which other agencies of the same Government are actively combatting on the part of private employers.

The 1967 Act, however, is not the only policy guidance available to the Department. Executive Order 11141, signed by President Johnson on February 12, 1964, makes it contrary to public policy for Government contractors to practice age discrimination in hiring and setting conditions of employment. That Executive Order, in describing the context in which it was issued, speaks of "the policy of the Executive Branch of the Government of hiring and promoting employees on the basis of merit alone and emphasizing the need to assure that older people are not discriminated against because of their age and receive fair and full consideration for employment and advancement in Federal employment."

Prior to this Executive Order, a Memorandum was signed by President Kennedy on March 14, 1963, addressed to the Heads of Departments and Agencies, and directing that "Federal appointing officers shall take positive steps to insure that current practice carries out this policy. Older persons," the memorandum continues, "must receive fair and full consideration for employment and advancement in the competitive service . . . With respect to Federal personnel systems outside the competitive service, these same principles are to be followed. All departments

and agencies are requested to review their policies and practices regarding maximum age limits in other than the competitive service, and to take steps to insure that such limits are established only when absolutely necessary."

The newspaper story quotes a Mrs. Jean Hawkins as saying that the age limit of 50 years is not a rigid one. "If we get a tremendous resume of someone 51 or so, it would not be a detriment to them." Mrs. Hawkins' comments indicate that the Department is refreshingly free of the notion that the fiftieth birthday serves as an absolute and actual barrier to the proper performance of public duties. But by the same token, her comments merely highlight the wholly arbitrary nature of the age limit apparently set in the Department's search for talented women.

There is no information available to me as to whether or not the 50-year mark is also prescribed for the appointment of male aspirants to high position in HEW. If it is, then age discrimination is even broader than I fear. If not, then an additional and equally obnoxious form of discrimination is being practiced by the Department. I would appreciate knowing which is the case.

Politically speaking, it would be tempting to simply assert that this situation arises from an insensitivity on the part of the new Administration to anti-discrimination legislation and policies of the previous Administration. But in all fairness, I doubt this is the case. What has probably happened here is that a requirement has been formulated in innocent ignorance of the requirements of present law and policy. I assume that you will take steps immediately to put a stop to this kind of arbitrary age discrimination by your Department. I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as conveniently possible.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11141—DECLARING A PUBLIC POLICY AGAINST DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF AGE

Whereas the principle of equal opportunity is now an established policy of our Government and applies equally to all who wish to work and are capable of doing so; and

Whereas discrimination in employment because of age, except upon the basis of a *bona fide* occupational qualification, retirement plan, or statutory requirement, is inconsistent with that principle and with the social and economic objectives of our society; and

Whereas older workers are an indispensable source of productivity and experience which our Nation can ill afford to lose; and

Whereas President Kennedy, mindful that maximum national growth depends on the utilization of all manpower resources, issued a memorandum on March 14, 1963, reaffirming the policy of the Executive Branch of the Government of hiring and promoting employees on the basis of merit alone and emphasizing the need to assure that older people are not discriminated against because of their age and receive fair and full consideration for employment and advancement in Federal employment; and

Whereas, to encourage and hasten the acceptance of the principle of equal employment opportunity for older persons by all sectors of the economy, private and public, the Federal Government can and should provide maximum leadership in this regard by adopting that principle as an express policy of the Federal Government not only with respect to Federal employees but also with respect to persons employed by contractors and subcontractors engaged in the performance of Federal contracts:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States and as Presi-

dent of the United States, I hereby declare that it is the policy of the Executive Branch of the Government that (1) contractors and subcontractors engaged in the performance of Federal contracts shall not, in connection with the employment, advancement, or discharge of employees, or in connection with the terms, conditions, or privileges of their employment, discriminate against persons because of their age except upon the basis of a *bona fide* occupational qualification, retirement plan, or statutory requirement, and (2) that contractors and subcontractors, or persons acting on their behalf, shall not specify, in solicitations or advertisements for employees to work on Government contracts, a maximum age limit for such employment unless the specified maximum age limit is based upon a *bona fide* occupational qualification, retirement plan, or statutory requirement. The head of each department and agency shall take appropriate action to enunciate this policy, and to this end the Federal Procurement Regulations and the Armed Services Procurement Regulation shall be amended by the insertion therein of a statement giving continuous notice of the existence of the policy declared by this order.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 12, 1964.

MEMORANDUM ON UTILIZATION OF OLDER WORKERS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE, MARCH 14, 1963

Memorandum for the Heads of Departments and Agencies:

In the message to the Congress transmitting my recommendations relating to a program for our older citizens, I pointed out that it is the policy of the Federal Government as an employer to evaluate each job applicant on the basis of ability, not age. This policy is intended to assure that the Government obtains the best possible talent from the widest range of choice.

The Federal Government has been an exemplary employer in this regard. There is no age restriction on appointments to competitive positions. However, with older persons constituting an ever increasing proportion of the Nation's work force and with growing evidence that older persons are capable of the highest quality work, Federal appointing officers shall take positive steps to insure that current practice carries out this policy. Older persons must receive fair and full consideration for employment and advancement in the competitive service. Personnel actions should be based, in accordance with merit principles, solely on the ability of candidates to meet qualification requirements and physical standards of the position to be filled.

With respect to Federal personnel systems outside the competitive service, these same principles are to be followed. All departments and agencies are requested to review their policies and practices regarding maximum age limits in other than the competitive service, and to take steps to insure that such limits are established only when absolutely necessary.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MR. HICKEL'S DILEMMA

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the February 1969 issue of *American Forests* magazine carried an editorial commenting on the nomination of Walter J. Hickel to be Secretary of the Interior. While

this editorial was written before the former Governor of Alaska was confirmed and sworn in as Secretary of the Interior, the views expressed on behalf of American Forests continue to have substance. Therefore, under unanimous consent I include the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

MR. HICKEL'S DILEMMA

Mr. Hickel may or may not be confirmed by the Senate when it examines him as to his fitness for the post of Secretary of the Interior later in January. Chances are he will be confirmed, for seldom if ever is a Cabinet appointment denied to an in-coming President. Honeymoons, no matter how brief, are usually the order of the day at such times.

But confirmed or not, there is no denying Mr. Hickel's unfortunate interview, prior to his confirmation and contrary to the explicit instructions of the President-Elect, got him off to a very bad start with millions of conservationists in the United States. There is much to be said for new Secretaries of the Interior being seen and not heard prior to their confirmations.

Right or wrongly conservationists now see Mr. Hickel as the last hurrah of an era that is either gone or soon will be when public domain resources were regarded as the exclusive private preserves of special interests.

In his interview, Mr. Hickel indicated he favors business as usual as it has to do with public land and that he is not in sympathy with conservation for the sake of conservation, whatever that means. Conservationists, with some justification, took it to mean he is not in favor of parks, wilderness areas, wildlife refuges and saving open space for its own sake if those things interfere with or get in the way of private development.

Possibly Mr. Hickel didn't mean it the way it sounded. We'll know more later. But conservationists are certainly justified, both in view of Mr. Hickel's own relationships with business interests in Alaska and his own statements, in demanding that the Senate examine him in depth as to his fitness to hold a post where the Secretary has to be the watchdog of the whole public interest and not just part of it.

His whole conservation philosophy, if any, should be laid out on the table for all to see. If indeed he intends to serve as a last hurrah for special interests the public is entitled to know it now. His reported statement that pollution reform standards may be set so high they will discourage new industry has stirred up another hornet's nest. Business as usual as regards the environmental field in general and the pollution area in particular is the last thing the conservation public wants at this particular juncture.

Mr. Hickel should know that times and views have changed in the lower 48 states. Conservationists and most of the public are of the view a Secretary of the Interior should be a tough, two-fisted public servant capable of saying "no" to self-serving special interests every hour on the hour. Specifically this means saying "no" to those people who may want to develop areas set aside for parks, wilderness areas, refuges and similar areas devoted to the whole public interest and not just part of it. This does not mean there isn't plenty of land for other purposes too. There is. But the public interest at all times should come first.

Admitting that businessmen seem to have a special knack for putting their feet in their mouths when it comes to such delicate nuances as the public interest, Mr. Hickel's blooper is certainly a beaut. He should be sweated plenty by the Senate and he probably will be. In all probability he will be confirmed but that will by no means solve the dilemma he now faces with conservationists. Once at his desk he would be well advised to call in the Natural Resources Council

of America without delay and take that potent group into his complete confidence with utmost candor.

In this way, the new Secretary, hopefully, if he really files right, could bridge what is already a sizable credibility gap before it becomes a major one. In this way he could win the support of the people he needs on his side if he intends to fight for all the people and not just some of them.

SAVING ENDANGERED SPECIES

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill which seeks to protect endangered species of wildlife by prohibiting their importation or interstate shipment. The fight to prevent the extinction of endangered species is a microcosm of the assaults on many fronts against the reckless exploitation of our natural resources.

Lucrative profits to killers of animals is the primary source of danger posed to the conservation of our most treasured resources. Many distinctive species are plundered for purposes of fashion. I hope that public opinion—determined to preserve rare forms of life—will oppose those who advocate that fashion takes precedence over protecting unique animals.

In our naivete, many of us fail to realize the actual costs of choosing a "genuine" alligator handbag or an "authentic" pair of alligator shoes over realistic imitations.

We sacrifice 50,000 alligators annually in Florida alone for such uses—but few shoppers stop to consider this price tag. And alligators are not the only animals facing extinction—over 250 wild species are rapidly disappearing, including the polar bear, the leopard, the cheetah, and the tiger.

We welcome growing public recognition of the plight of sought-after species—which are becoming more rare each day. For our hypocrisy is becoming more and more apparent—if we continue to hail ourselves as champions of conservation we will have to act upon our sweeping promises. In short: we will have to develop new ways to prevent the eradication of endangered species. What is destroyed can never be replaced. We may have to choose between certain leathers and furs in commercial use or the preservation of some species.

My bill would prohibit the importation of endangered species of fish and wildlife or their parts into the United States except by special permit from the Secretary of the Interior for zoological, educational, scientific, and breeding purposes.

My bill would insure that the United States live up to the responsibilities implicit in its role as leader in the conservation of world wildlife.

The passage of my endangered species bill, curtailing this destructive traffic, cannot be put off indefinitely. Time is precious. We must act now.

RHODESIANS CELEBRATE LIBERTY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, last, the bloodless Rhodesian revolution from Britain was made lasting with the purge of the Union Jack and the hoisting of the new green and white flag of Rhodesia.

Britain, the United States and the U.N. economic blackmail failed, and to be honest—the economics have whiplashed. We need southern Africa more than she needs us.

The economic boycott as an economic weapon served only to hurt people—including U.S. businessmen—and while we were a party at hurting people, the Rhodesians as well as other South Africans were helping their people—unifying their populations.

With the rest of Africa a torment of revolution and chaos—south of the Zambezi River, no African nation has been able to entice its black population to rebel, or join in sabotage of their country under any pretext, whatsoever.

Our hats are doffed to a minority who have kept the peace—progressed their people and restrained their liberties from the colonial intervention of the U.N.

Free people the world over, look to the United States of America. We need only for our new President to repudiate the ridiculous sanctions by Executive order to reaffirm our belief in liberty and self-determination.

Mr. Ashton Williams, a Rhodesian tobacco farmer and journalist now visiting the United States of America, gives us his version of the new republic which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch for February 23, 1969, which I include in the RECORD:

RHODESIANS CELEBRATE PURGE OF UNION JACK
(By Ashton Williams)

Happy men and women are dancing again in Rhodesia: "Here's to us—and our Ian!" They sense the end of the three-year impasse is in sight.

Since my forecast in these columns last September that Rhodesia would sever the ties of empire and commonwealth on Nov. 11, 1968, the hoisting of the green and white flag of Rhodesia—purged of the Union Jack—confirms it, and Rhodesia is sovereign, free and established, a nation in being.

For the first time in 173 years, Great Britain is facing realities in Africa. An astonishing change sweeps London's 10 Downing St., where Prime Minister Harold Wilson now refuses to support those of his colleagues who want him to declare categorically there can be no promise of independence for Rhodesia until majority rule for the Bantu is established.

In his completely new approach to the problems of Rhodesia and South Africa, following the fait accompli of Nov. 11, 1968, Wilson has kept the direction of affairs with Prime Minister Ian Smith in his own hands. Gone is the acrid belligerence of 1965: "We shall bring Rhodesia to her knees in a matter of weeks." Instead, a pragmatic Harold Wilson, facing facts, is courageously defending Rhodesia, even fighting her battle in person on the floor of the House of Commons.

This dramatic denouement, so recent and so complete, is a political climacteric, unparalleled in British party politics, which thrusts the prime minister back to the world stage as a man of destiny. It also explains why he and Ian Smith so doggedly kept the "on again, off again" talks going, when all hope of compromise seemed utterly impossible. Obviously, these statesmen glimpsed something their colleagues did not. As history proves, the paths of destiny meander through strange mazes and tunnels, bungling as it were, to focus-point and climacteric.

Britain is paying respectful heed to the bankers and industrial leaders of the Western world—the watch dogs of the world's major storehouses—where the basic materials that supply and keep the wheels of America's huge industrial complex turning, the economy rising and balanced, giving life, and bread, and employment to countless thousands on both side of the Atlantic.

These are matters germane to the joyous dancers that spell out messages of hope from London and Washington, proclaiming that the scramble for modern southern Africa's markets is on. It dominates Wilson's change of attitude, coupled with his struggle to increase Britain's share of South Africa's \$300,000,000 export market, which nets Britain a juicy 30 percent and goes a long way to protect the pound sterling in South Africa.

But since Britain has imposed an arms embargo on South Africa, her minister of finance, Meneer Jan Haak, warns that unless this is lifted, she might seriously pare that juicy melon, a warning not likely to be ignored.

Through many channels, American industry is making it plain to the Pentagon that it is sheer nonsense to support sanctions against Rhodesia, when they deprive American factories of desperately needed products, America must purchase at premiums of 12½ per cent, often from Russia—like chrome, for instance.

The realities speak with a loud and eloquent voice, which the dancers interpret: sanctions are doomed.

What considerations face Rhodesia now that Wilson has given such clear notice he intends to let Prime Minister Ian Smith's regime have its way?

She can choose to remain outside the commonwealth, like South Africa, or join it. Many practical reasons suggest that South Africa and Portuguese Angola and Mozambique would prefer Rhodesia to maintain an economic and trading tie with the United Kingdom, which could give them, through Rhodesia, a loose connection. Always provided, of course, Rhodesia's sovereign status and separate national entity remains sacrosanct. This mutual concern for each other's independent status emphasizes the possibility, perhaps the certitude, that a defense alliance between South Africa, Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, and Rhodesia is a written document.

It is poetic justice that the Portuguese and Dutch are still masters of the country their sailors discovered so long ago—in 1485 and 1496, respectively—but sheer tragedy that Britain, who could have made Africa the gem, crown and sceptre of a world commonwealth, started its disintegration instead, on the very first day she arrived in Table Bay, in 1795, to rape it, and continued under many regimes—Tory, Whig, Liberal, Labor and what not—to destroy, piece by piece, the paradise they found, and could have inherited by co-operation.

The leadership that Great Britain should have supplied, she denied, the responsibilities she ought to have accepted as a sacred trust, she refused to accept, and sold her birthright and heritage for a mess of pottage, chasing the mirage, dominant power, before going down to utter moral and political defeat in Africa, and dishonor, which must be her epitaph in Africa and history.

South Africa, Portuguese Angola and Mozambique and Rhodesia will assume the torch of leadership which destiny, for the second time, has passed to them.

During the last 30 years, particularly during the last 20, these three, the only white-governed nations in Africa, have expanded their economic growth, developed their agricultural resources, built highways, railways and dams, and created an industrial empire, which ranks amongst the world's most important.

Johannesburg and Pretoria, and the satellite towns for hundreds of miles around them, are the most modern, diverse and important, anywhere south of the equator.

Johannesburg, which began as a single house, where gold was found in 1886, is today the largest city the continent of Africa has ever had, with a population approaching 1,600,000. Like Rhodesia, and the Portuguese territories, it has enjoyed unbroken peace and prosperity for almost 65 years. Moreover, during the last 10 years of unrest and anarchy in central Africa, beyond the Zambezi, no African nation has been able to entice its black population to rebel, or join in sabotage of their country, under any pretext, whatsoever.

South Africa and her allies, including German South West Africa, through their policy of building modern houses for their indigenous black populations, are becoming slumless. As a matter of fact, South Africa itself, will probably become the first to achieve that distinction, closely followed by Rhodesia and South West Africa.

The industrial complex, known as the "RAND", is also the location of South Africa's first atomic unit, built outside Great Britain for industrial purposes under Sir Basil Schonland, a born South African, who headed Britain's Harwell Atomic Center, and was also a member of that famous "hush hush" team that developed radar at Cambridge University's Cavendish Laboratory, during the early months of World War II and which made victory in the Battle of Britain possible.

South Africa and her allies come to leadership equipped with all the skills and experience of their advanced civilization, able to speak all the languages of their numerous tribal groups, a communication advantage no other nation, in or out of the commonwealth, can remotely approach.

The deeply divided Commonwealth Conference just ended in London was influenced by the "ghost presence" of Rhodesia and South Africa whose vacant seats powerfully moved the assembled heads of state. Those vacant seats symbolized prosperous Rhodesia and South Africa, silently opposed to the belligerent and vocal Afro-Asian groups calling for the destruction of Rhodesia and South Africa, per se.

There are other strains and stresses in the commonwealth.

Australia, an important member, is striving to prevent her racial stance from reaching the mass-media press, and world agendas, because she bears a controversial label: white Australia.

Indeed, she is the only country in the civilized world whose doors are bolted and barred to Asiatics and the colored races, whether British subjects or not. This anomaly threatens stormy debates to come. It is not likely therefore that South Africa or Rhodesia will permit themselves to be maligned, without pointing an accusing finger: "Why are we branded as racist, and not Australia? Is Australian territory sacrosanct? If so, on what pretext?"

In the final analysis, history will record that Harold Wilson took the commonwealth and southern African crises into his own hands, to face a divided House of Commons and the nation, and declare to the world that Great Britain had found her soul and won her independence, too . . . and that

neither he, nor his country, will bow to blackmail.

The mantle of genius and greatness may be denied Wilson by political partisans, but history will extol his character and courage, and greatness among his peers, in November and December, 1968, and January, 1969, when he reversed his own attitude towards southern Africa. It was he who made the unpopular decisions, and bluntly told his own party members, and the Bantus in England and elsewhere, that, for particular reasons of self-preservation and the protection of the world's food supplies, that he must withdraw all promises of support for any who turn to sabotage, as well as those who proclaim their intention to wipe out white civilization south of the Zambezi River.

It was a towering, changed Harold Wilson who warned them there was no room for mawkish sentimentality to overcrowd an already overcrowded Great Britain—12 million too many—who should be defending the perimeters of the commonwealth. It was Harold Wilson, the statesman, who reminded Zambia, Tanzania and Kenya, that they, too, have obligations to keep the peace, and protect the life and limb and property of all their people.

In these last weeks, which cannot restore British prestige in southern Africa, nor reverse Rhodesia's Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI), sovereignty and nationhood, Harold Wilson, the pragmatist, has managed to give Leadenhall and Threadneedle Street a stake again in South Africa's economy and trade, and whatever by-products and diplomatic benefits may accrue and flow from the removal of tension, secrets which only he and Ian Smith at this moment share. It is almost ironic anti climax that after three years, Ian Smith and Harold Wilson, are the only statesmen to survive with enhanced reputations, vis-a-vis Southern Africa.

GILBERT BILL TO RAISE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to raise the personal income tax exemption to \$1,000. The present \$600 exemption is allowed for the taxpayer, spouse, dependent—with limitations—and an additional \$600 exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who is 65 or over, and each taxpayer or spouse who is blind. My bill will increase the exemption for all of these categories.

The low- and middle-income taxpayer needs the relief my bill will afford. He is not concerned so much with capital gains and stock options. He is concerned chiefly with the level of personal exemption and the tax rate applying to his taxable income. The last time the exemption figure was revised was in 1948, and the consumer price index has risen by 44.6 percent in that 20 years. The exemption was first provided in the Revenue Act of 1913 and subsequently the 16th amendment was adopted authorizing a Federal tax on incomes. At that time there was a \$3,000 individual exemption plus an additional \$1,000 for each dependent. When the issue was debated in the House at that time, a prominent Member, who later became Attorney General of the United States, expressed it this way:

We ought to leave free and untaxed as a part of the income of every American citizen a sufficient amount to rear and support his family according to the American standard and to educate his children in the best manner which the educational system of the country affords.

We are not doing this today when our present tax laws provide only a \$600 personal exemption—an amount that does not begin to permit a tax-free subsistence level or income.

The middle-income group pays more than one-half of the total individual income taxes collected, a highly disproportionate burden. Their tax burden is increased because they are contributing to the support of the upper income groups who pay little or no taxes because of preferences under our present tax laws. And add to this the 10-percent surtax that hurts the little taxpayer the most, and which I opposed.

My Committee on Ways and Means is conducting hearings at the present time on overall tax reform. I am taking an active part in these hearings. We are re-examining our tax structure as it relates to tax-exempt organizations, cooperatives, foundations, and wealthy individuals who avoid their fair share of taxes. Certainly tax reform is needed, and I favor the closing of loopholes through which billions escape the Treasury each year.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make every effort to have my bill—and other proposals to ease the tax burden of the low- and middle-income taxpayer—included as a part of any tax reform bill reported out of my committee. And I favor the repeal of the surtax as soon as possible.

AN IDEALIST WHO IS WILLING TO WORK FOR HER COUNTRY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think we all have a good idea of some of the activities of a small percentage of this Nation's students. Their activities are chronicled on the front page of nearly every paper across the Nation.

But I also hope that we all realize that student demonstrators represent only a small portion of our young people. I received a letter from a former constituent of mine, Eugene M. Fuller, with an enclosed speech written by Miss Judy Brantley.

In his letter, Mr. Fuller said:

It seems that protestors are heard and seen and we take for granted those that do their part, perhaps not as loud and vocal.

I would like to insert into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the speech that Miss Brantley, age 17, of Clewiston, Fla., delivered to the Order of Rainbow Installation:

YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICA

Are you embarrassed to be an American? Too many people just don't seem to care about what is happening in the United States. How many people, when asked to recite the pledge of allegiance—inwardly

grumble at the time it takes up and inconvenience it causes? When the national anthem is played—who really listens to this great song and is proud to be an American? And how many people today are indifferent to the vast potential which lies inside them, which, if developed—will contribute to America's greatness? America is nothing more than a reflection of the people within.

My purpose today, is to impress upon you, your responsibility to America. Until I went to Girls State last summer, I can truthfully say that I was a very poor example of a patriotic citizen. My whole outlook on life was changed in this one week. I met people with deep convictions in God and our country. I was given the opportunity to run for government positions and was honored to become a Senator. We passed bills, debated, and most important, we learned about our American government by actually having complete participation in it . . . even though this was a mock situation. This one week taught me many important things. It also gave me an unshakable belief in the foundations of our country and the high principles for which our forefathers stood. It awoke in me a funny thing called patriotism that I never realized existed in me before. Patriotism is not necessarily the flag-waving, psalm-singing fanaticism that may come to one's mind. I choose to think it is a deep belief in and responsibility for one's country.

This responsibility to America is what will make our country greater or smaller in the years to come. Every young person in this room is a potential leader of our country. We can make a better America by being better citizens—citizens who are interested in their government and the people who run it. We will determine what happens to America and I have faith in the youth of this nation. Never let your idealism become disillusioned by anyone or anything. Idealists who are willing to work will make a better country. We cannot afford to lose this idealism with age . . . a better America lies waiting for us to shape and mold it. Her destiny is in our hands. It will take a lot of work and one hundred percent participation. Are you willing to give it a try?

TAX LOOPHOLES

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Davenport Times-Democrat recently featured an editorial on the subject of tax loopholes and tax reforms. The editorial does an excellent job of expressing the frustration, and even anger

of the taxpayers of this country who have been paying their fair share of our tax bill. They are no longer willing to tolerate an inequitable system with loopholes such as now exist. Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

PLUG THOSE TAX LOOPHOLES

The ordinary taxpayer no doubt is more than a little disturbed at the stories he reads about rich men who employ tax dodges, tax havens, and the like to avoid paying their fair share.

Twenty-one persons with incomes exceeding \$1 million each in 1967 paid no taxes. One hundred and fifty-five persons with incomes of a mere \$200,000 in the same year didn't pay taxes either.

President Nixon has committed the new administration to coming up with a tax reform program. And given the serious inflationary situation existing today, Mr. Nixon probably will have to request Congress to extend the 10 per cent surtax tax into fiscal 1970. But its impact surely will bear heavily on the ordinary taxpayer who has a hard enough time making ends meet under the regular schedule.

The "middle classes" are not opposed to fair taxes but their spokesmen contend that certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay.

Exemptions have been written into tax laws for specific groups, most of them for plausible or legitimate reasons. Then the need for the exemptions declines or lapses and they become "loopholes" defended by entrenched groups. Many beneficiaries have found tax havens not originally intended.

The granddaddy of all loopholes is the 27½ per cent oil depletion allowance which has been heavily protected by congressmen for oil states. Theoretically the allowance compensates oil men because the oil in the well is being used up (depleted), just as other businessmen take deductions on depreciation of plant and machinery. (Usually they don't explain how their investment in explorations gave them sole title to a natural resource vested in all the people.)

For other business men the depreciation ultimately stops at the end of the facility's normal useful life. For the oil well people the loophole goes on and on, year after year, as long as the well produces. The Treasury Department estimates the cost of the average oil well is recovered 19 times over. Big U.S. oil companies pay much lower tax rates than ordinary corporations.

Congressmen say their mal has been running heavily in favor of eliminating the inequities in the present system. Still, many Washington observers think Congress itself has been the chief obstacle to tax reform.

It seems clear enough that the grass-roots discontent over unequal burdens and loopholes can be ignored only at the peril of the people's elected representatives.

IMMIGRANT WARNS OF MARXIST UTOPIA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 3, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor from an anonymous immigrant in San Diego, Calif., touched me very deeply. The writer reminds us of the many blessings and freedoms we in America take for granted and the fact that we must remain constantly vigilant to protect our rights from those who would undermine our Nation both from without and from within.

The letter follows:

EDITOR, THE UNION:

Dr. Herbert Marcuse is an immigrant, so am I.

While he was raised in affluence and coddled as a youth and in his adult years, I experienced biting hunger and hard miserable work as a child and almost starvation as a youth in order to get through college.

Everything that I ever dreamed of and never had before, I found here.

Now, along comes this immigrant who never experienced my miserable sufferings and preaches a poisonous philosophy by claiming I belong to an insane society because I love comfort and conveniences and freedom.

I achieved these goals through work and the American economic system. I have no intention of ever giving up that kind of life.

When I took the Oath of Allegiance I swore to defend this country. Little did I realize then that one day I had to defend it from within.

An immigrant philosopher who should teach the difference between a privilege and a right is trying to pull the rug from underneath the American people whose sons and fathers died fighting a country from where he fled.

They sheltered him and gave him, above all, freedom. He is making \$25,000 a year. For that he is teaching the young and gullible how to destroy their father's achievements, their mother's love and their country's innocents, the children.

A revolution is nothing pretty. It is death and tragedy.

A Marxist Utopia is a rotten-at-the-core way of life. I know. I come from there, a Marxist promised land.

Americans, black and white, better begin to realize fast that they have something going good for them here and better hang onto it and appreciate it.

M. C. H.

SAN DIEGO.

SENATE—Tuesday, March 4, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, guide of the years that are past, and hope of the years to come, accept the service of the hearts and minds of all Members of this body "in order to form a more perfect Union, es-

tablish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." To this end wilt Thou remove every barrier which separates man from man, class from class, race from race, and fuse us into one mighty body—heart to heart, mind to mind, soul to soul, strong in the Lord and in the power of His might.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 28, 1969, be dispensed with.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were commu-